

AN HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE
AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

445

by

VINCENT S. DI SALVO

B.S., WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY, RIVER FALLS

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1966

Approved by:

Fred J. Barnes
Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1966
DG2
C.2
Document

PREFACE

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to his graduate advisor, Dr. Ted Barnes, for his constructive suggestions, competent guidance and constant encouragement from the beginning to the completion of the thesis.

Additional appreciation is expressed to Dr. Norma Bunton, Dr. Terry Welden, Dr. Howard Hill and Professor Kingsley Given for their time and help in collecting data.

Finally, appreciation is expressed to my parents, Steve and Dorothy for simply being what they are.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
LIST OF TABLES	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
History of the Problem	1
Review of the Literature	4
Justification of the Study.	26
Statement of the Problem.	28
Purpose of the Study.	28
II. PROCEDURES UTILIZED IN THE STUDY.	30
III. RESULTS OF THE STUDY.	36
Historical Overview of the Basic Speech Course.	36
Instructor Evaluations of the Basic Speech Course.	58
Basic Speech Course Across the Nation.	73
IV. CONCLUSIONS FROM THE STUDY.	81
Historical Overview.	81
Instructor Evaluations.	83
Comparison.	84
General Observation...	86

Chapter

Page

APPENDIX A. THE COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO SURVEY THE FORMER SPEECH INSTRUCTORS	87
--	----

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	94
----------------------------------	----

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Time in the classroom spent on Theory and in Practice.	59
2. Frequency of speeches given in class.	61
3. Relative Importance of the Fundamentals Commonly Covered in the Basic Course.	61
4. Time in the classroom spent on theory and in Practice.	64
5. Frequency of Speeches given in Class.	65
6. Relative Importance of the Fundamentals Commonly Covered in the Basic Course.	67
7. Time in the Classroom Spent on Theory and in Practice.	69
8. Relative Importance of the Fundamentals is Commonly Covered in the Basic Course.	71
9. Comparison of Mean Value and Rank Results Across Three Time Periods.	72

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM

Education has the unique characteristic of reflecting the temperament of the time in which it exists. This seems to be especially true of the development of speech education in America, and, more specifically, the basic or beginning course in speech. Since the establishment of the first colleges in America, training in speech-making has held an acknowledged place in higher education, though its details and methods have been constantly altered by the demands of the contemporary society.

During the colonial days, speech training consisted predominantly of training clergymen to preach the Gospel. With the crises and challenges of the middle eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries came the development of a functioning democratic society. This democratic society placed a new demand on speech education; that demand was to teach the prospective leaders of the land a fluency and flexibility of speech that would enable them to speak to all types of people in a manner that would bring tangible results to their own cause.

As the desire and demand for effective speaking increased, more and more emphasis was placed on speech content with little stress on the other elements of speaking. After 1800, it was realized that excellent speech content was futile if the speaker could not present it effectively to his audience. The result of this realization was the growth of the mechanical

elocutionary approach to speech. This approach became the dominant emphasis in speech education in the latter part of the nineteenth century and early years of the twentieth century.

Although speech education has been in existence in the United States since the seventeenth century, it was not until 1913 that speech actually became a distinct academic area. Also interest was growing among educators toward initiating a basic speech course on the college and university level. Educators, as well as society, were becoming more aware of the importance of educating the populace to meet the many demands of a dynamic, rapidly growing society. One of these demands was to educate the people in basic speaking abilities in order that they could communicate intelligently and effectively.

Within recent years public speaking courses have taken an important place in our State Universities. The more progressive institutions, such as Michigan and Wisconsin, have established separate departments of instruction in this field....in most instances the development of the courses has been especially adapted to that training for citizenship which is the highest function of the State University.¹

Through a survey of the literature regarding the beginning course in speech, it was learned that during the twentieth century the basic speech course did not follow a universal pattern of development. Speech departments across the land developed their basic course in a manner they thought would best meet the needs of the students attending their school. There were institutions that used the elocution-delivery emphasis, others emphasized the declamation, still others spent the majority of class time

¹v. A. Ketchman, "Public Speaking Courses in State Universities," Education Review (February 1917) 152.

emphasizing the values of extemporaneous speech and so on. With Kansas State University's commitment as a State institution to educate and produce citizens for the democratic society, the following question grows in importance. What has been done here at Kansas State University regarding the basic speech course since the courses beginning in helping the student become a better citizen?

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A considerable body of literature has been built up during the past fifty-five years on the basic speech course. Over two hundred articles have appeared in the professional journals. Although it would appear at first glance that the field has been adequately covered, in fact there does not appear to be any published material on this specific topic. Each individual author in the field seems to represent his own unique approach.

Literature on the Problem. The major area of interest in this study was the basic speech course at Kansas State University, and its development in comparison to basic courses at other universities.

One of the first articles to appear concerning the basic course in speech was prepared by Frederick B. Robinson in 1911.¹ It was essentially a request that a basic speech course be offered to college and university students. Robinson observed that most educators require all students to take an English composition course, but nothing in "Oral English." Most schools assumed that the entering freshmen possessed an adequate ability to express himself. However, their assumptions were ill-founded, as many college freshmen used sub-standard speech, poor choice and arrangement of words and awkward and ineffective gestures in their speaking.²

This general belief, although couched in different words, has been repeated many times since. Others such as Elmer W. Smith,³ Edwin Dubois

¹Frederick B. Robinson, "Oral English as a College Requirement," Public Speaking Review, I (1911) 2-7.

²"Aims and Standards of Speech Education," Q.J.S.E., IV:4 (1918) 345-365.

³Elmer W. Smith, "Oral English as a College Entrance Requirement," Public Speaking Review, I:2 (1911) 78-84.

Shurter,¹ Frederick Abbott,² Milton J. O'Neill,³ and Albert M. Harris,⁴ saw the need for "Oral English" in the classroom and also for a department of speech separate from the English Department. In general terms the aims of the course would be to help the student think straight, to be more efficient and effective with his words and to help him develop into a good and vocal citizen in a democratic society.⁴

The Public Speaking Trend

When James A. Winans began his teaching career at Cornell University in 1900, the beginning course in speech had a declamation emphasis. He suggested that in order to develop public speaking, which he believed should be improved and enlarged conversation, beginning speech courses should begin with something as near as possible to conversation. To Winans this meant using extemporaneous speeches with a "think the thought" emphasis. In January, 1911, he made public these ideas in an article entitled, "Department of Declamation."⁵ This article was one of the first published discussing a specific basic course in speech.

Under Winans, the beginning course at Cornell emphasized practical public speaking whereby the lawyer, engineer or businessman could learn to

¹Edwin Dubois Shurter, "Oral English in the Schools," Public Speaking Review, II:5 (1912) 148-154.

²Frederick Abbott, "The Teaching of Oral English," Public Speaking Review, II:2 (1912) 35-40.

³Milton J. O'Neill, "Departments of English and Public Speaking," Public Speaking Review, II:7 (1913) 231-238.

⁴Albert M. Harris, "Fostering Oral English," Q.J.S.E., XI:2 (1925) 124-130.

⁵Milton J. O'Neill, "Aims and Standards of Speech Education," Q.J.S.E. IV (1918) 345-65.

⁶James A. Winans, "Department of Declamations," Public Speaking Review I:3 (1911) 98-102.

effectively present his own ideas. The student began with short, extemporaneous speeches on campus topics, trying to develop a conversational directness and reality. Later the student presented short declamations to improve his delivery and voice control and correct other weaknesses.¹ Lee Emerson Bassett² outlined a similar first year course in speech at Stanford University in the next year, 1912.

In 1917, Winans³ published another article dealing with the beginning speech course at Cornell. In the intervening years, Winans' course had expanded. The course had become a requirement for students in Architecture and Civil Engineering, but it was open to other student in accordance with the rules of their colleges.⁴ The course was offered on a semester basis with three meetings per week. Most of the actual drilling and outline work was done by appointment with individuals or in small groups. Winans, in trying to keep a natural setting for the speakers, rotated the speakers so that they had opportunities to speak before new and varied audiences on different occasions. Lectures in the course covered points such as "conversing with the audience," "principles of attention," "emotion," "gestures," and "delivery." Winans altered the course from year to year in order to meet the needs of the students.⁵

The beginning speech course at Washington and Jefferson College in Pennsylvania devoted little time to voice training. Wilbur Jones Kay in

¹James A. Winans, "Department of Declamations," Public Speaking Review, I:3 (1911) 99.

²Lee Emerson Bassett, "The Place of Declamation in the College Curriculum," Public Speaking Review, I:8 (1912) 238-41.

³James A. Winans, "Public Speaking I at Cornell University," Q.J.P.S., III:2 (1917) 153-162.

⁴Ibid., 155.

⁵Ibid., 155.

an article presented in 1917, indicated that his was considered a practical speaking course for the student.¹ The student gave speeches in exposition, narration, description and action as related to everyday experiences. The student was not asked to declaim any pieces of literature nor was he drilled or lectured on voice or gestures. The same type of course was presented at Drake University² in Iowa and at Pennsylvania State University,³ and at Smith College of Massachusetts.⁴ However, the course at Smith did emphasize voice training and considered such points as breathing, opening of throat and mouth, tone, change of pitch and resonance and vowels.⁵

The Elocution-Delivery Trend

In his article, "College Courses in Public Speaking," Fulton described the elocution course at Ohio Wesleyan College. The course was unlike the old fashioned elocution approach of the 19th century and provided the student with the fundamental principles which form the broad foundation or the philosophy of expression. To Fulton the student needed to learn the elements of delivery before anything else. Thus, his course offered not only a knowledge of the science of elocution, but also furnished

"...practical training in expressive power...a study and development of the vocal organs and muscles; respiration; 'vocal culture,' a study and drill in the vocal elements, time, quality, force; technique and practical application of the elements of actions; conception of gesture; reading and recitation of illustrative extracts..."⁶

¹Wilbure Jones Kay, "Course I in Public Speaking at Washington and Jefferson College," Q.J.P.S., III:3 (1917) 242-48.

²Frank E. Brown, "Extempore Speaking at Drake University," P.S.R., I (1911) 87-88.

³Robert T. Oliver, "One Hundred Years of Teaching Speech: An Interpretation," Speech Teacher, XI:3 (1962) 249.

⁴Elva M. Forncrook, "A Fundamentals Course in Speech Training," Q.J.S.E., V:3 (1918) 271-289.

⁵*Ibid.*, 278.

⁶Robert Irving Fulton, "College Courses in Public Speaking," P.S.R., III:7 (1914) 205-209.

Fulton believed that it was better to give the student more "expressive power" than to drill in his faults and weaknesses.

Thomas C. Trueblood of Michigan also stated his corresponding belief that the basis of all public speaking courses should be through study of the principles of elocution. It is best to give the student knowledge of "the psychology of the vocal and breathing organs, of the essentials of good articulation and pronunciation, much practice in difficult sounds and words, and an understanding of the laws of emphasis and drill in its application..."¹ The student would usually practice aloud a well-selected passage of literature.

In an article appearing in the Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, in 1917, William R. Duffey² describes the "foundation course" at the University of Texas. The foundation course was divided into three sections. The first section emphasized delivery and voice and ran from fall to Christmas; the second section used declamations and ran from Christmas to Easter and then extemporaneous speaking from Easter to June. All three sections were considered a part of the course, but because delivery and voice improvement were considered most important they were offered first and many students elected to take only the first section.³

In further description of his course, Duffey indicated that the first portion of the class hour was spent in lecturing on specific speech topics, such as change of pitch, voice inflection, and the last portion of the hour was spent utilizing the techniques presented earlier in the classroom. Before any student approached the platform to speak, lectures were given

¹Ibid., 205.

²William R. Duffey, "The Foundation Course in Public Speaking at the University of Texas," Q.J.P.S., III:2 (1917) 163-171.

³Ibid., 166.

treating the areas of speech in imagination, memory, spontaneity, response of the body, emotions and passion, dramatic instinct. On the subject of voice and breathing, six lectures were given. After these subjects were covered, the students were allowed to give short memorized paragraphs before advancing to the declamation section.¹

The aim of the course at Texas University was to lead the student toward the attainment of greater perfection and power in speech. They believed the way to do this was to give the student a thorough background in delivery and voice development.

At the University of Michigan the content and method of instruction were left to the individual instructor." In one semester, the student spoke approximately fifteen times in the classroom. The course did not stress content in the speeches, but did seek to help the student improve his voice and delivery through the use of declamations. It was believed that once the student could deliver the words others have spoken he was on his way to becoming an effective speaker.² The declamation approach for improving delivery and voice was supported by Paul M. Pearson of Swarthmore College,³ H. M. Tilroe of Syracuse,⁴ and A. M. Harris of Vanderbilt University.⁵

¹William R. Duffey, "The Foundation Course in Public Speaking at the University of Texas," Q.J.P.S., III:2 (1917) 155.

²Hollister, "The Aims of a Beginning Course," Q.J.S.E., VI:3 (1920) 173.

³Paul M. Pearson, "How I Conduct a Course in Declamation, P.S.R., I:6 (1912) 136-137.

⁴H. M. Tilroe, "The Place of Declamation in the College Curriculum", P.S.R. I:5 (1912) 136-173.

⁵A. M. Harris, "Declamation in the College Curriculum," P.S.R., I:5 (1912) 124-130.

The University of Wisconsin presented a somewhat different approach to the beginning speech course. Harry G. Houghton, writing in 1917,¹ described the University of Wisconsin's course as one in which a broad foundation was laid in speech with training in reading, declamation and extempore speaking. The student received enough instruction in speech organization to enable him to present his ideas in an orderly manner. Except for his phase, the course was a laboratory approach in which the student continually worked or drilled on some aspect of speech, usually in front of the class. The Wisconsin approach used declamations to stimulate the imagination of the student by interpreting the thoughts of others. The course also tried to help the individual student with his unique speech problems, thus trying to strengthen through drills that part of each student's speaking that was weak.²

The Mental-Hygiene Trend

In an article entitled, "The Mental Hygiene Approach in a Beginning Speech Course,"³ Wayne L. Morse presented the opinion that the primary purpose and educational value of a beginning course in speech was not to teach the student how to give a good speech, but rather to develop the student's personality and behavior traits and to enable the student to more satisfactorily adjust himself to his social environment. The drilling of a student in front of a class did him little good if he had a behavioral

¹Harry G. Houghton, "A Beginning Course in Public Speaking," Q.J.S.E. IV:2 (1918) 150-159.

²Harry G. Houghton, "A Beginning Course in Public Speaking," Q.J.S.E. IV:2 (1918) 152.

³Wayne L. Morse, "The Mental Hygiene Approach in a Beginning Speech Course," Q.J.S., XIV:4 (1928) 543-553.

problem causing him to be an ineffective communicator. This idea against the drill method clearly contradicted the drill emphasis of the beginning speech courses at the University of Texas, Wisconsin and Michigan.

Other articles appeared, such as those by Lee R. Norvell,¹ Bryng Bryngelson,² Horace G. Rahskoph,³ Laura Whitmore Young,⁴ and Edward Z. Rowell,⁵ calling for the basic speech course to be more aware of the individual's behavior in a changing society, rather than to be concerned with simply grading speeches. These instructors felt that the average student entering college had an adequate speaking ability with no serious articulatory problems, and was, to a large extent, able to talk with other individuals. Thus they concurred with Bryngelson when he said that "...of greater importance is the study which centers around the emotional and mental life of the person who is trying to influence the behavior of an audience."⁶ This approach to speech instruction felt that instead of simply teaching elocution, formal speaking, debate, oral interpretation, or phonetics in the basic course, more time should be spent relating speech principles to the students' behavioral development. Azubah J. Latham believed the student in speech should be helped in every way to feel emotionally and vocally ready, eager and able to speak whenever called upon to do so.⁷

¹Lee R. Norvelle, "A Consideration of Individual Differences in Classroom Instruction in Beginning Courses," Q.J.S., VI:2 (1922) 53-60.

²Bryng Bryngelson, "Speech Hygiene," Q.J.S., XXII:4 (1936) 611-614.

³Horace G. Rahskoph, "Principles of the Speech Curriculum," Q.J.S., XXIII:2 (1937) 452-456.

⁴Laura Whitmore Young, "Character Development through Speech Training," Q.J.S., XVII:4 (1931).532-538.

⁵Edward Z. Rowell, "Public Speaking in a New Era," Q.J.S., XV:1, (1931) 62-67.

⁶Bryngelson, 612.

⁷Azubah J. Latham, "The Present Outlook for Speech Education," Q.J.S., XVII:3 (1931) 345-351.

The Communication Trend

In 1938, Hurst R. Anderson in his article, "A New First Course in Speech-English,"¹ suggested and supported the combining of Speech and English in the basic speech course. He described the course as it existed at Allegheny College in Pennsylvania. The course presented a combination of oral and written composition through which the student was instructed in the similarities and differences between the two and taught to use each one effectively.

Michigan State College combined English and Speech into one department in 1944. Paul D. Bagwell described the course in the Quarterly Journal of Speech² in 1945. This approach appears to be a complete change from what most schools were doing at the time of the article. The course at Michigan State College was a requirement for all students. It was offered on a quarterly basis with three credits for five class hours per week. These five hours were divided in the following manner:

1. Hour of lecture in sections of approximately 300 students.
2. One-hour recitation periods--the enrollment of each section not in excess of twenty-five students. In those periods, each student was to be required to give six speeches ranging in length from two to five minutes. It was here that voice instructions were offered as needed.
3. Two one hour supervised writing periods (writing laboratory) each section was limited to a maximum of twenty students.

The unique fusion of these two skills was an effort to help the student speak, write, read and listen effectively in a communicating society.³

¹Hurst R. Anderson, "A New First Course in Speech-English," Q.J.S. XXIV, (1938) 70-78.

²Paul D. Bagwell, "A Composite Course in Writing and Speaking," Q.J.S., XXXI:1 (1945) 79-87.

³Bagwell, 83.

The importance of effective communication was also realized by the United States government. During World War II, the United States Air Force and Army Training programs integrated English and speech into one class and entitled it "communications." This information is set down in articles by James N. Holm,¹ McDonald W. Held and Colbert C. Held,² and George V. Bohman and John V. Neale.³

While certain colleges and universities across the nation adopted the term "communications" as their course title, there appears to be little similarity in what was offered at the various schools. Foremost of these approaches was the one at Denver University and described in an article entitled, "A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course."⁴ The course had three aims: the communication skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening; the integration of the personality of the communicator; and the social responsibility of the speaker and writer as a member of society. The course tried to achieve the general educational goals of helping the student with his behavior, as well as with his communication. The student wrote term papers, participated in group discussions and gave speeches on topics which usually related to his desired vocation.⁵

¹James N. Holm, "A Wartime Approach to Public Speaking," Q.J.S., XXXI:1 (1943) 10-13.

²McDonald W. Held and Colbert C. Held, "Public in the Army Training Program," Q.J.S., XXIX:2 (1943) 143-146.

³George W. Bohman and John V. Neale, "What Can We Learn from Military Speech Courses?" Q.J.S., XXXI:2 (1945) 134-142.

⁴Paul Wilson, Frederick Sorenson and Elwood Murray, "A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course," Q.J.S., XXXII:2 (1946) 232-244.

⁵Wilson, Sorenson and Murry, 232.

The approach to "communications" at Northwestern was different from the Denver approach as indicated in an article by Glen E. Mills.¹ The course was more of a communication skills emphasis seeking to improve specific qualities: self confidence in a speech situation, directness, meaningful action, expressive voice, general preparation, specific preparation, analysis of subject, constructive use of suggestion, arrangement, means of support and oral style.² The course attempted to present the student with an over-all picture of communications and the idea that winning the desired response was the goal of communications. It was believed that the teaching of techniques in communicating would play down "exhibitionism" and call the speaker's attention to the importance of gaining the response desired.³ Also, in this article Mills mentioned the leading universities in the communication skills approach as the Universities of Iowa, Michigan State and Minnesota.

The approaches to communication courses of New Jersey State Teachers College and Troy State Teachers College of New York are unique and worth noting. At New Jersey, as indicated by Marion E. Shea,⁴ the English composition and public speaking courses were replaced with one course that subordinated writing and speaking. The course was directed toward the future teachers taking the course. It changed public speaking to social intercourse and group discussion, reduced individual performances, and

¹Glen E. Mills, "Speech in a Communication Course, Q.J.S., XXXIII:1 (1947) 40-45.

²Ibid., 42.

³Glen E. Mills, "Speech in a Communication Course," Q.J.S., XXXIII:1 (1946) 43.

⁴Marion E. Shea, "Education of the Elementary School Teacher in Communication Skills," Q.J.S., XXXIII:2 (1947) 222-224.

increased group expressional activities.¹ The students gave individual or team speeches in which "how-to-do" or "how-to-make" something was explained.

Janet S. Rosenberg² reported that Troy State utilized a group discussion technique to co-ordinate communication through reading, writing, speaking and listening. The object of the group discussions, which were usually on current social problems, was to teach the student to speak his ideas clearly and to listen effectively to others. Through the use of performance tests the student was made aware of his weaknesses in any of the communication skills and worked to improve them in the class room. Very little was done in drill sessions or in actual public speaking.

In the early decades of the century, leading institutions such as the University of Texas, Smith College, Massachusetts and Ohio Wesleyan College placed the emphasis in the basic speech course not on overall communication but on voice and diction. That is, the majority of class time was devoted to voice drills rather than to public speaking. Two specific institutions using this approach as recently as 1954 and 1963 were the University of Miami, Florida, and Washington Square College, in New York City.

Raymond Van Dusen, in an article appearing in the Southern Speech Journal³ describes the voice and diction approach at the University of Miami. The course was based on the fact that there were large numbers of

¹Ibid., 223.

²Janette S. Rozenberg, "A Basic Course in Communication Skills," Southern Speech Journal, XX:4 (1955) 345-352.

³Raymond Van Dusen, "Three Interpretations of the First Course in Speech," Southern Speech Journal, XX:2 (1954)

students whose voice and diction required improvement, and they believed these two factors should receive attention before a student entered upon speech courses where performance was essential for an adequate grade.

Washington Square College presented a speech course that tried to solve the problems of the student that may interfere with effective communications, according to Maryann Peins and Mary Pettas.¹ The course dealt with problems common in articulation and pronunciation. After a semester the student is able to enroll in the "true" fundamentals course where the student participates in various speech situations such as conversation, oral reading, public speaking, discussion, oral reports and parliamentary procedure. The aim of the course is to reinforce and strengthen the articulation, diction and intonation and the other work initiated in Speech I.²

Four other unique approaches have been described in various articles and are worth mentioning. James East and Eleanor Starkey³ describe the course at Parsons College, Iowa, as basically a rhetoric and public speaking course. The course traces the concepts involved in oral discourse from Aristotle to modern times. The student analyzes classical speeches from Greek, Roman, English and American sources, and then concentrates on composition and delivery for original speeches. The course is offered on a semester basis for three credits. Classes are held five days a week, with two days being spent in mass lectures (200-250 students) covering the ethics

¹Maryann Peins and Mary Pettas, "A College Speech Improvement Course," Speech Teacher, XXII:1 (1963) 38-42.

²Ibid., 40.

³James East and Eleanor Starkey, "The First Speech Course: Rhetoric and Public Address," Speech Teacher, XV:1 (1966).

of rhetoric, free speech in a democratic society, organization, and analysis of model speeches and different types of speeches. The remaining three days per week are spent in small performance groups of twenty-five students each. In these groups, each student is required to make twelve speeches per semester, and voice and delivery are worked on as time allows.¹

The second approach was mentioned in the November, 1953, issue of The Speech Teacher.² At Louisiana State University the basic course was taught in an "assembly-line" fashion for three reasons: over-crowded conditions in the basic course, the student's desire for speaking practice to gain poise and self confidence, and the belief by the department that individual instruction is essential in the basic course.³ In the class room both the students and the instructor are aware of the time element and strive to use every minute. When speaking before the class, the students are assigned a number to follow and they must sit in the "get-set" chair while students with the previous numbers are speaking. After each speech the instructor gives individual comments but limits himself to one minute or less. Besides public speaking the student will also participate in oral reading and group discussions.

In an article entitled, "Usefulness of a Debate in a Public Speaking Course," John Graham develops a rationale for inserting formal debates in the basic speech course. Graham believes that debate would make the beginning speakers more aware of what is involved in trying to communi-

¹Ibid., 69.

²Eugene E. White, "Assembly Line Techniques: Teaching the Large Class in Speech Fundamentals," Speech Teacher, II:4 (1953) 247-56.

³White, 248.

cate their ideas to another in an organized and clear manner.¹

Finally, Hildebrant and Sattler at the University of Michigan want to see "The Common Materials Plan" used in more basic speech courses. They have the students read common basic themes to gain source material for their speech topics. After three or four students have agreed on a general subject area, they reword it into a question and then pick specific areas relating to the problem. Informative speeches are given on aspects of the problem, then students participate in panel discussion on possible solutions to the problem, and finally each student gives a persuasive speech advocating the solution he prefers.²

Speech Surveys on the Basic Course

In an attempt to develop a general overall picture of the basic course, articles reporting questionnaire catalogue surveys of the basic course were studied. An early catalogue survey of twelve New England colleges was taken by Bromley Smith³ revealed a lack of organization and initiative in speech education in that area. The study describes the disorganized conditions in speech education that existed in various schools in the New England section of the United States and what was done to alleviate those conditions.

The colleges surveyed offered courses in public speaking with a range of instruction emphasis through such areas as, "vocal, platform deport-

¹John Graham, "Usefulness of Debate in A Public Speaking Course," Speech Teacher, XV:2 (1966) 136-139.

²Herbert W. Hildebrant and William M. Sattler, "The Use of Common Materials in the Basic Speech Course," Speech Teacher, XII:1 (1963) 19-25.

³Bromley Smith, "Public Speaking in New England Colleges," Q.J.P.S., III (1917) 57-58.

ment, interpretation, extemporaneous speaking, oral expression, oratory, study of speeches, forms of public address, elocution, declamation and argumentation."¹

The general purposes of these courses offered were "to help intonation and articulation in speaking, to build poise, to develop clear thinking and to improve gestures."² Smith's study was presented in 1916 to the New England Public Speaking Conference with the resultant adoption of the following resolution:

"...to recommend...a minimum course in Public Speaking. We suggest that this course be entitled 'Elements of Public Speech' and that it be given three hours a week for two semesters ...such a course would permit much needed concentration on voice, delivery, organization of material, diction, etc."³

In 1928, Charles A. Fritz⁴ presented the results of a survey that he had taken of forty of the most prominent teachers colleges in the United States that offered a four year program leading to a baccalaureate degree. The data compiled in Fritz's study were taken from questionnaires completed by, and bulletins from, the various colleges.

According to the bulletins, and in order of frequency mentioned, the general teaching objectives of the courses were:

¹Ibid., 58.

²Ibid., 65.

³Charles A. Fritz, "Speech Courses in the Teachers' Colleges," Q.J.S., (1928) 82-86.

⁴Ibid., 83.

1. to train students to gather and arrange material for speeches.
2. to teach the student to express his thought to an audience with freedom, force, and ease.
3. to help remove fear and self-consciousness.
4. to correct faults of voice and speech.
5. to develop better platform manners.
6. to give the student a basis for self-criticism"¹

Generally, the courses consisted of presentation of the theory of speech through various text assignments, lectures and outside readings; laboratory work consisting of speeches, readings; and criticism offered by the instructor.

The questionnaires revealed that in a majority of the schools surveyed the main emphasis was on the preparation and delivery of speech material. In other schools, stress was placed upon interpretation and original speaking with the intention of covering the fundamentals of the entire field of speech.

In summary, the study revealed that the most prevalent course procedures were to begin with short informal speeches, progress to longer ones, and at the close of the term, have a final eight to twelve minute speech. Topics covered varied in accordance with the interests of the individual student; however, those areas most frequently presented were contemporary questions in fields such as economics, politics and sociology.

In 1942, a committee on Teacher Education² conducted a survey to determine the place of speech education in teachers' colleges across the United States. A questionnaire was sent to 138 teachers colleges in 37 states with the responses coming from 82 colleges representing all geographical regions. The following is a composite of information obtained through the questionnaires:

¹Charles A. Fritz, "Speech Courses in the Teachers Colleges," Q.J.S., (1928).

²By Committee on Teacher Education, "Speech in Teacher Education," Q.J.S., XXXII:1 (1946) 80-102.

The principal objectives of the fundamentals course were:

1. to develop ability to participate successfully in everyday speech situations
56 colleges - 68.3%
2. to improve voice and diction for everyday use
54 colleges - 65.8%
3. to speak effectively from the platform
46 colleges - 56.1%
4. to eliminate speech defects and faults
43 colleges - 53.4%
5. to read intelligently and effectively from the printed page
41 colleges - 50.0%
6. to develop good speech for the classroom
9 colleges - 10.9%¹

A comprehensive overview of the development of speech education in science and engineering schools was given in the survey conducted by Lester McCrery in 1953.² Questionnaires were sent to 140 colleges with 122 responses. The over-all findings indicate a general agreement that training in speaking is needed in the science and engineering schools on a regular basis.

Prior to 1900, only one school of those surveyed had had a speech training requirement, and in the next twenty years only five additional schools adopted the requirement. In the decade 1920-29, nine more schools adopted regular speech training. The 1930's found twenty-three more colleges adopting the requirement, and during the 1940's, twenty-four additional schools adopted a speech program. "The initially slow but consistent expansion to include regular speech training courses

¹Ibid., 101.

²Lester Lyle McCrery, "The Status of Speech Education in America's Science and Engineering Colleges," Speech Teacher, II:3 (1953) 181-190.

as a requirement gave indication that realization of the importance of speech education in the fields of science and engineering was being made."¹

McCrery's survey revealed that 53 (43%) of the colleges questioned required a course in public speaking of all their undergraduates. In addition, undergraduates majoring in some selected divisions or areas had to fulfill a regular speech training requirement in 26 (21%) of the colleges surveyed.²

Generally, the content of the course was of expository and persuasive materials. A prescribed number of speeches, averaging six per student per term, was required in regular speech classes. These speeches ranged in length from two to fifteen minutes.

In 1956, for the Committee on Problems in Undergraduate Study of the Speech Association of America, Donald E. Hargis³ surveyed the first course in speech in 440 universities and colleges across the nation. The 229 questionnaire responses gave Hargis a representative geographical overview as well as a representation of small and large institutions. The results are presented in the following discussion.

The typical class is a single semester in length, carries three units of credit, and in 94.2% of the schools it is planned for all students. The areas of instruction offered in the beginning courses varied widely, covering such areas as speech composition, speech delivery, audience analysis, critical listening, voice, diction, oral interpretation, discussion, persuasion and vocabulary. However, only

¹Ibid., 182.

²Donald E. Hargis, "The First Course in Speech," Speech Teacher, V:1 (1956) 26-33.

five areas--speech composition, speech delivery, audience analysis, voice and diction--are considered indispensable.¹

The respondents' indicated that their offerings in the basic speech course were in the following areas:

- 64% - public speaking
- 19.2% - fundamentals
- 4.9% - voice
- 2.2% - remedial speech
- 1.7% - oral communications
- 1.3% - communications skills
- .9% - semantics
- .5% - communication of technical information,
conversation, listening and oral interpretation²

In presentation and grading of the first course in speech,

"62% gave approximately equal weight to course content and emotional adjustment. Only 27.7% attempt to give the same emphasis to both theory and practice; 71% stress practice over theory; and 1.3% emphasize theory over practice."³

The principle objectives of the first course were:

1. To instruct the student in the fundamental principles of speech.
2. To help the student develop self-confidence and poise.
3. To provide practice and instruction in effective speech delivery.
4. To develop effective voice and diction methods.
5. To provide practice in effective oral expression.
6. To train in adequate speech composition.
7. To train in clear speech organization.⁴

In summation, Hargis states that: "The objective values, the relative stress on content versus theory and on theory versus practice and the division of time (over 74% of it spent in practice activities) demon-

¹Donald E. Hargis, "The First Course in Speech," Speech Teacher, V:1 (1956) 32.

²Ibid., 28.

³Ibid., 32.

⁴Donald E. Hargis, "The First Course in Speech," Speech Teacher, V:1 (1956) 28.

strates that the class is basically a skills course."¹

To determine professional attitudes toward the basic speech course in central states colleges and universities, Norman T. London² conducted a questionnaire survey. He sent questionnaires to three hundred institutions fully accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

From the 235 questionnaire responses, he reported that 97.9% of the institutions in the survey offered a "fundamentals" or first course in speech (or one similar to it but with a different title). The two most frequently mentioned titles were, "Fundamentals of Speech," by 44.6% and "Public Speaking," by 10.7%. Less than 6% had fused the first course in speech with English composition.³

As indicated by 69.7% of the respondents, the course is usually one semester in length, meeting three hours a week (42.4%) with two semester credits for the course (40.2%). The mean enrollment appears to be twenty students in each section of the course. 38.4% required the first course in speech for all bachelor degree candidates while another 47.8% required the course for some bachelor degree candidates. The freshman year was cited by 28% as the year in which students most frequently fulfilled the first course requirement.⁴

¹Ibid., 32.

²Norman T. London, "Professional Attitudes toward a First-Course Requirement in Speech in Central State Colleges and Universities," Central States Speech Journal, XIV:3 (1963) 173-176.

³Ibid., 173-4.

⁴Ibid., 173-4.

Turning to course content, 95.7% indicated that extemporaneous speaking was the area most emphasized in the course. Other areas of course content mentioned were listening habits, diction, voice, impromptu speaking, persuasion, group discussion and oral interpretation.¹

In short the beginning course in speech in the Central states area appeared to be a public speaking course emphasizing extemporaneous speaking.

¹Ibid., 175.

III. JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

In a Speech Department there is perhaps no course that is of greater importance, at least in terms of reaching and influencing the greatest number of students, than the basic speech course. Because the course is normally a requirement for large numbers of students in many schools, as is the case at Kansas State University, it affects the student population directly, and should continue to influence them for years to come.

This required course may have far-reaching affects since it may be the only course in speech which thousands of college students will have. Such a course will determine what college graduates will know about speech and will largely determine what their attitudes toward speech will be.¹

Because of the position which the basic course holds in the educational system, its influence is considerable. It is not to be denied that there are other required courses in the student's curriculum, such as biology, history, English composition and physical education, but it is doubtful if there is any single subject the individual will use everyday as much as his speech training.

The third value which we think the student should obtain from his four years at Kansas State College is a real proficiency in the art of communication. As a producer and as a citizen his true success or failure depends vitally on his ability to analyze and assess what he hears or reads, and to state logically and clearly what he knows, thinks or wishes to ask.²

Because our society is one that permits man to advance on his merits and achievement, the importance of communicating effectively gains importance

¹Marceline Erickson, "Improving Speech Programs: Needs, Trends, Methods," Speech Teacher, XII (1963) 22-29.

²Milton Eisenhower, President of Kansas State College, "Report to Kansas," Radio Broadcast, 1950.

if one is to be a successful citizen. Since the course is constructed to "help" the student to become a more effective communicator rather than to "produce" public speakers, the course's influence reaches into the most personal areas of life, home, politics, religion, economics and education.

This study investigated the basic course at Kansas State University for the following reasons:

(1) The importance of the basic speech course given the time the Faculty spends on the course and the energy involved in teaching about two thousand students a year taking the basic speech course.

(2) A natural interest to investigate the course because there have been no previous studies investigating the history and development of the basic course at Kansas State University.

(3) Kansas State University represents the Midwest Land Grant system and has a long tradition of speech education however, nothing has been done to record and compare this tradition of speech education with other institutions.

(4) There is a responsibility of a Land Grant School to produce citizens for society. The basic course at Kansas State University has played a part in this task and the changes need to be studied in terms of what the previous conditions were and how it compares to what is happening across the nation.

Therefore, based on the importance of the basic speech course to the student, to the society, to the department, to the nature of the school, and the recent changes made in a traditional emphasis in the basic speech course, it is useful to investigate the basic speech course to see what has happened. Considering the importance of the course to the department and its significance

in the speech profession, it is argued here that the basic speech course at Kansas State University is a legitimate area of study in the field of speech.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The basic problem to be investigated is the history of the basic speech course at Kansas State University as it has developed from its beginning and a comparison of the course in light of the development of basic courses at other universities.

V. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is threefold:

1. To present chronologically and systematically an historical overview of the development of the basic speech course at Kansas State University.
2. To investigate the development of the basic speech course at other universities.
3. To compare the development of the basic speech course at Kansas State University in light of the development and trends in the field of speech.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented to some degree the situation regarding the basic course in speech. It has surveyed the literature to develop a background for understanding the problem. Also, the general purposes of the study were presented. It has sought to emphasize the role of effective communications for the individual and his society as well.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES UTILIZED IN THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to set forth the procedures used to achieve the purpose of the study, as outlined in chapter one. Because of the nature of the study, the research involved both historical and descriptive methods.

Any study demands selection and limitation. This study was limited to the basic speech course at Kansas State University, disregarding other course offerings of the department.

A. Historical Overview of the Basic Speech Course at

Kansas State University

In the development of the historical overview the following sources of historical information were investigated: college catalogues at Kansas State University, college newspaper articles, personal letters, committee reports, historical reference books on Kansas State University's history, course syllabi and course objectives. The sources were investigated directly with no opportunity for cross reference or secondary interpretations since the documents had not been incorporated in any other writings.

The major source of information was the annual college catalogues from the beginning of the school to the present. The catalogues were investigated for the following information: departmental philosophy, course descriptions, academic credits, and curriculum requirements. They were recorded on notecards and placed in a chronological progression to show changes and trends.

The other historical sources contributing to the overview were

approached in a similar manner. However, there were a number of personal letters written to former Kansas State University speech instructors by the researcher in an effort to clarify points or to gather more details.

Another research method used in the overview was the in-depth personal interview of persons who had been responsible for the basic course. The interview was used to collect detailed data about the basic course that could not be learned by employing mechanical means, i.e., a questionnaire. The individuals interviewed were: Dr. Howard T. Hill, Department Head from 1920-54; Professor Kingsley Given, who taught the basic course from 1930-39 and from 1950 to present; Dr. Norma Bunton, who taught the basic course from 1954 to present and has been Department Head since 1960; Dr. Terry Welden, Chairman of the basic course program since 1960.

The interview was one intended to stimulate past experiences and memories of the individual. To accomplish this a written guide was prepared with information and questions that were within the interviewee's frame of reference. However, the guide was used as a suggestive reference for discussion rather than a schedule to be rigidly followed.

Prior to the interview session a room was selected that was familiar and comfortable to the interviewee and which would permit as much privacy as possible. Also, the written guide and the purpose of the interview were discussed with the individual to give him a perspective of what was desired and to start him focusing on past experiences.

In the interview session, the respondent's conversation were placed on a tape recorder to insure an accurate transcription at a later date. The respondent was permitted to verbally recall past experiences, however at times the interviewer asked the interviewee to relate and reconstruct

various phases and sequences of events. The interviewer often took brief notes during the session, but he did it in such a manner that it did not reflect disinterest or enthusiasm in the responses being made. After the session the tapes were replayed and all pertinent information was transcribed on notecards for future reference.

After all the historical data had been collected, analyzed, and organized, a rough overview was prepared and submitted to Professor Kingsley Given for a critical analysis of the interpretations of all the primary data. This was done because there were no secondary sources for cross references.

B. Evaluation of the Basic Course by Former Instructors

A structured questionnaire¹ was developed during the Spring of 1965. It was the goal of this instrument to secure information about the basic course from instructors who had taught the basic course while teaching at Kansas State University. The population sample was composed of all those instructors who could be traced to their present location. Fifty-one instructors were located, and their tenures covered the years from 1915 to the present.

The questionnaire developed for this survey was designed with this specific group in mind, and was constructed to be a self-enumeration questionnaire.² Because of this the essential definitions and instructions for the completion of the form were listed on the questionnaire itself. The survey was concerned with collecting data solely about the basic speech

¹See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire used in this study.

²A questionnaire that is mailed to the respondent who usually completes it with no opportunity to ask questions or seek additional information.

course, or more specifically, about the following areas: descriptions of the course, aims of the course, ratio of grade computation based on tests and performance, handling of speech topics, ratio of time spent on theory and in practice, criticism of speeches, and the relative importance of fundamentals used in the classroom. Because of the nature of the topic-areas being investigated two types of questions were devised for this survey: Open-ended questions permitted the respondents to report answers in their own way without restrictions, and "closed-questions" which forced respondents to make ranking decisions about already structured items.

The closed-questions were set up in table form for the respondents calling for them to check the appropriate items. Special attention should be made to the development of the "fundamental importance table." Here the respondents were asked to check eight speech fundamentals according to how the instructor included them in the course. The five values were based on a Likert rating¹ of values. A sixth value was included entitled "Don't remember," in case the respondent could not or preferred not to evaluate a particular fundamental.

Once the questionnaire was devised it was presented to other members of the Speech Department for their comments and criticism. The questionnaire was not widely pretested because of the nature and small size of the population to be surveyed. After the discussions the questionnaire was reorganized into final form. It was then ready to be sent to all instructors whose present addresses had been located.

Along with the questionnaire was included a cover letter and a

¹The Likert rating is based on a five value continuum with equal distance between the values. The following words were used: Heavily emphasized, Generally emphasized, Just Covered, Generally not covered and Intentionally not covered.

self-addressed stamped envelope. The questionnaire was mailed out during the first week in June, 1965, and a request was made on the cover letter to return the completed form by June thirtieth. After the deadline had passed a postal card reminder was sent to the delinquent instructors. Returns sufficient to bring the total above seventy-five per cent had been received from the mailing, so no further mailings were attempted.

In tabulating the results, all responses to open-ended questions were placed on notecards along with the year of the instructor's arrival at Kansas State University. The data were then organized into general patterns or trends based on the responses to the questions. The closed-question responses were placed on frequency tables to determine percentage accounts of what was stressed in the basic course. A final table was constructed listing the mean values and the rankings from each of the time periods regarding how the fundamentals were emphasized by the instructor in the classroom. The mean values were computed after giving each of the values a numerical weight and then determining means by the frequency count. Then, for each fundamental a rank order was determined based on its mean value. The rankings between different time periods were compared by Spearman rank-order correlations,¹ $r_s = 1 - \frac{6\sum d^2}{N^3 - N}$. This statistic was used for three reasons: the data were not from a normal population and did not meet the requirements of parametric statistics; the ranks of the variables were the only information available; the Spearman r gave a direct evaluation of the similarities of ranking in different time periods.

¹Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, (New York 1956).

C. History of the Basic Course at Other Universities

In the investigation of the literature to determine what the basic courses were like at other institutions, the traditional techniques of library research were utilized. That is to say bibliographies, footnotes, index publications, and professional journals were searched for data. All individual issues of the professional journals were examined lest anything be missed through oversight. The following journals contained the majority of information used: Quarterly Journal of Speech; Speech Monographs; Speech Teacher; Central States Speech Journal; Southern Speech Journal and Western Speech Journal. All the data were placed on notecards and organized by subject matter and chronology.

D. Comparison of the Kansas State University Basic Course

The comparison of the basic speech course at Kansas State to other basic courses across the country was based on the data in the following areas: review of the literature, historical overview; instructor evaluations; history of the basic course at other universities. In light of these results a comparison was made.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the procedures used in this study. The procedures involved both historical and descriptive methods of research. Involved was the development of an historical overview of the basic course using historical techniques and personal interviews, the development of a questionnaire which would survey those who had taught the course over the years, the treatment of the data secured from the survey, and the establishment of a general trend of the basic course at other universities by using the traditional techniques of library research.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

I. HISTORICAL OVER-VIEW OF THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE AT
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

The historical overview of the basic speech course at Kansas State University as recorded in this section covers a sixty-three year period, 1903-1966. There has however, been some form of speech education in existence since the school was founded in 1863. The recording has been made as a result of investigation of the school's curriculum and catalogues since their inception, as a result of personal interviews with various educators who have been involved in the basic course and finally as a result of examination of letter, syllabi and historical reference books.

HISTORY OF THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE AT
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Since 1863, when classes first met on the campus of Kansas State Agricultural College, to the present, considerable attention has been given by this institution to the area of speech education. In the early years of the college all students were required to take a general course in public speaking. Generally, the course content was based on the following statement, published in the 1874 Kansas State Agricultural College Hand-Book:

all the prospective speech makers in a round of calisthenics to develop their body, as well as help them to orate.

Professor Metcalf was a disciple of the mechanical, elocutionary school which was flourishing throughout the nation during the early years of the twentieth century. Although Professor Metcalf left the department in 1901, his elocution philosophy remained for a time, as witnessed by the following course descriptions which appeared in the 1900-01 college catalogue:

1. Physical Culture...Consists entirely of movements without apparatus, designed to give health, strength, freedom and grace to the body, in order that if may act quickly and truly in obedience to the highest thought, feelings and purposes of the soul.
2. Voice Culture...Daily practice on exercises for freedom, flexibility, volume and harmony of voice.
3. Rendering...To cultivate original thought.
4. Public Speaking...Each 3 year student is required to appear in public speaking in the Chapel twice during the year.¹

All four of the above courses were required of the student and the first three courses were prerequisite to appearance in the Chapel recitals. The first two courses were taught five days a week and were given during the first two terms in the Agricultural and Mechanical-Engineering courses and during four terms each in the Domestic and Science courses.

It was the aim of the Oratory department through these four courses "...to develop the powers of the student's mind, that he may be able to think clearly for himself and to express his thoughts

¹Kansas State Agricultural College Catalogue, Thirty-eighth Annual, 1900-01, Manhattan, Kansas, 65.

effectively in oral form."¹ This clearly reflects the purpose of the land grant college of preparing its students to become good citizens.

If the college offered anything that resembled a basic speech course during its first forty years, it would have been the "Rhetoricals", declamations and the four courses or areas of instruction under Metcalf. All students were required to take them and they were so constructed that they were adaptable to the needs of the students from the various curriculums. The courses generally consisted of practical work with the student spending most of the class time in practice or drills. The student received constructive criticism and suggestions while working individually with the teacher. From the catalogue descriptions, the courses were skill courses designed to help the student overcome any voice impediments before learning to give "formal" orations and original declamations.

Despite what value Metcalf's physical-elocution approach to speech may or may not have had, the Oratory Department did not feel that this method met with their objectives and in 1901, they dropped his method and substituted courses that they felt were more related to practical speaking. Their published statement regarding this change was:

We do not train students to read or recite as an end, but use the reading and reciting as a means to aid in the development of natural delivery or original thought.²

The four courses presented under Professor Metcalf were changed to Oratory I, Oratory II, Oratory III, Oratory IV and Public Speaking.

¹Ibid., 64.

²Kansas State Agricultural College Catalogue, Thirty-ninth Annual, 1901-02, Manhattan, Kansas, 72.

Oratory I was spent in drill trying to develop the student's ability in vocal expression. Oratory II taught the student extemporaneous speaking and debate. Oratory III and Oratory IV were not required of all students (but they were available to all.) And the Public Speaking course required that the student, during his junior year, present a declamation in the Chapel and during his senior year, an original oration on a topic of his own choosing.

Each course was held five days a week for one semester; the majority of time in each course was spent in practice with criticism given by the instructor as needed. There were occasional lectures. Oratory I and II and Public Speaking were required of all students for graduation. These three were required of students on a premise stated in the college catalogue:

Few are the opportunities for delivering a committed speech, but numberless are the occasions that demand the expression of thought extemporaneously.¹

It appears that the courses Oratory I, Oratory II and Public Speaking were primarily concerned with the correcting of any poor speaking habits and then training the students to be able to express their ideas in an intelligent fashion. Thus, through instruction calling for memorized "pieces" and extemporaneous speeches, the Oratory Department was fulfilling its objective:

"We should train for active citizenship. The entire work of this department is based upon the principle that all expression is the result of thought."²

The course's emphasis since 1901, had shifted from the mechanical-

¹Ibid., 72.

²Kansas State Agricultural College Catalogue, Fortieth Annual, 1902-03, Manhattan, Kansas, p. 78.

elocution approach to one that was more natural for public speaking. The shift was primarily made because the Oratory Department had no intention of training students as professional readers but rather as good citizens capable of intelligent vocalization of their own thoughts.¹

With the arrival of Professor Julius Kammeyer in 1903, Oratory I became Public Speaking I and Oratory II became Public Speaking II. Both courses were required of all students. Each course was taught five days a week on a semester basis. Public Speaking I, which the student took during his second year, stressed vocal development and covered four general types of speaking:

1. Paraphrasing as a preparation for expression
2. The principles of grouping
3. Musical properties of speech
4. Practice in literary and expressional criticism²

Selected exercises in vocal techniques were given throughout the course.

The principles of vocal expression presented in Public Speaking I were applied in Public Speaking II to literary wholes and selected orations, the purpose being "...to cultivate taste, judgment and facility in the art of expression."³

The course continued to develop and in 1909-10, Public Speaking was changed from a five credit course to one of four credits. It was a requirement in the curriculums of Agriculture, Veterinary Medicine, Printing, Home Economics and General Science. The catalogue description

¹Kansas State Agricultural College Catalogue, Forty-first Annual, 1903-04, 95.

²Ibid., 95.

³Ibid., 95.

indicates that the course began

"...with a study of the fundamental principles and accepted rules of public address. These are applied in the interpretation of selected masterpieces of general literature and oratory, and then in the delivery of original subject matter by each student, the class serving as his audience and critics. Some time is devoted to exercises in correct breathing, articulation and tone production, to fit these to the individual needs of the students."¹

The course Public Speaking II, was dropped and Extempore Speech I was added in its place. The course carried two credits. This course in extempore speaking was essentially only an abbreviated form of Public Speaking I. It was required in the schools of Engineering and Architecture. The course dealt, most specifically, with improving the student's articulation and with teaching the student to present public speeches. The aim of both courses was to teach the principles of speaking on a level that would be applicable to and by all students, regardless of their curriculum. Thus,

"Students in agriculture are trained in the presentation and discussion of agriculture facts before supposed audiences of farmers. Students in engineering, home economics and architecture, etc. are trained in speaking on subject matter relating to their respective courses of study, and to their probable needs and activities in later life. Conviction, not entertainment, is the dominant purpose in every case."²

An administrative change regarding speech education came in 1912, when Public Speaking I and Extempore Speech I were no longer required of all students. Only those students in General Science and Industrial Arts had to take Public Speaking I and those students in the divisions of

¹Kansas State Agricultural College Catalogue, Forty-seventh Annual, 1910-11, Manhattan, Kansas, 212.

²Ibid., 212.

Mechanic Arts were required to take Extempore Speech I. The content of the courses remained the same.

Professor Kammeyer left the Oratory Department in 1911. No changes were made in the department until Dr. James Gordon Emerson arrived in 1915. Dr. Emerson described his changes in the course in the following manner:

"I cut the four-unit course to two which made it possible for more technological students to fit it into their schedules...The student's homework consisted mainly of preparation for his speech rather than extensive study of textbook theory. Criticism in class and individual consultation went along with this."¹

The general purpose and content of Public Speaking I was:

"...to enable the student to attain some proficiency in the art of oral interpretation. The training given seeks to develop a natural style. In connection with the practice work upon the platform, the student is given such points of theory and such routine drill as are necessary for the development and use of the voice and for proper platform development."²

Extempore Speech I was required in General Science, Industrial Journalism and Engineering. The general content of this course was preparation and delivery of short speeches based on a prepared outline. Careful preparation of the material and a general plan of the speech was to have been made in advance while the actual choice of words was determined at the time the speech was rendered.³

With the arrival of Dr. Emerson, "Extempore Speech became the

¹Personal letter received from Dr. James Gordon Emerson, Received: June 9, 1965.

²Kansas State Agricultural College Catalogue, Fifty-third Annual, 1915-16, Manhattan, Kansas, p. 326.

³College Catalogue, 53rd, 326.

course that was least dispensable"¹ to the students in their respective curriculums. In accentuating Extempore Speech I, Dr. Emerson's idea was:

"...to make the course strictly a service course for students in Engineering, Agriculture, etc. who, loaded with work elsewhere, had not much time for public speaking. This called for a minimum of time spent on text book theory and emphasis on actual speech-making before the class as an audience."²

It was essentially, though not in name, a basic speech course. The general aims of the course, as cited in the Fifty-third Annual College Catalogue were:

"...to harmonize them with the spirit of the school, which is distinctly technical and industrial. With this object in view students are trained in the presentation and discussion of the valuable ideas acquired in their various fields of study. The method pursued in this training is that of actual practice on the platform before an audience..."³

It was not until the arrival of Dr. Howard T. Hill, in 1920, that Public Speaking I was dropped from the department. Thus, in 1920, Extempore Speaking I became the basic course in speech at Kansas State Agricultural College. From that point, the name of the course remained basically the same until 1945, when it became Oral Communication III; then in 1947, it was changed to 103 Oral Communication, and finally, in 1952, it became 105 Oral Communication. The course remained a two credit hour course throughout the changes in title.

¹Personal letter received from Dr. J. G. Emerson, Received: December 18, 1965.

²Personal letter from Dr. J. G. Emerson, June 9, 1965.

³College Catalogue, 53rd., p. 325.

Although the names given to the basic courses in speech have changed over the years, the content and emphasis had remained basically the same from 1915 to 1954, as was made evident to the author in a personal interview with Dr. H. T. Hill, department head from 1920 to 1954.

The following statements are excerpts from that interview:

Author: Did you change the course or re-examine it?

Dr. Hill: Not particularly. We would adopt some things here and there and drop things, but rather infrequently because we had not only a standard but also a sensible approach to it. No need to change the course as time goes.

Author: After the course became a college requirement in 1945?

Dr. Hill: Not as far as I was concerned. Same emphasis, same objective, same method.¹

With this continuity existing in the structure of the course, generalizations will be made that will be applicable to much of the forty-five year period.

The basic course under Dr. Hill, followed a number of general philosophies. He saw the purpose of the course as simply "...to help people to learn to speak and to act. To gather and organize it, (speech material) and then, this is the most important thing, practice."² Professor Kingsley Given³ saw the purpose of the course "...to help the students at Kansas State University to make a better appearance and make a better looking product of Kansas State on the platforms and the meeting places throughout the state." and "I suppose it was primarily to help

¹Personal interview with Dr. Howard T. Hill, conducted on May 27, 1965.

²Interview: Dr. H. T. Hill, May 27, 1965.

³Personal interview with Professor Kingsley Given, conducted on May 28, 1965. Professor Given has taught the basic course from 1930-39 and from 1950- and is presently teaching it at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.

people speak in an effective manner, not a flowery manner, but an effective one." This appears to be the same opinion as was stated in the college catalogue:

"It is the constant effort of the Department of Public Speaking to relate the training in public speaking with the work of all other departments of the college and to harmonize it with the spirit of the college... students are trained in the presentation and discussion of the valuable ideas acquired in their various fields of study."¹

To simplify, the aim of the course was to teach the student to gather and organize material and present it in an effective manner; to encourage him to practice speaking as often as possible before other people and to aid the student in expressing his ideas in his own field of learning.

It was Dr. Hill's philosophy to allow each instructor who taught the course to teach it as he or she saw fit. This is supported in a letter from one of the instructors who taught while Dr. Hill was Department Head. "To a great extent, each person used his own methods -- aimed at reaching the common objective of giving a student experience in presenting short, well-planned and well-organized extempore talks to the rest of the class."² Further proof of Dr. Hill's philosophy came in an interview with Professor Kingsley Given, "Dr. Hill would hire people that had shown an ability to teach the course and he didn't care how they did it. He would never interfere."³

¹Kansas State Agricultural College Catalogue, Fifty-eighth Annual, 1920-21, Manhattan, Kansas, 309.

²Personal letter received from Harison B. Summers, Received June 29, 1965. Harrison Summers taught the basic course from 1923-31 at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.

³Interview: Professor Kingsley Given, May 28, 1965.

To enhance this freedom of instruction no textbook was "officially" used in the basic course until 1945, when the Department adopted Alan Monroe's brief edition entitled, Principles of Speech. Dr. Hill explained his "no book" philosophy thus:

"We do not use a text in extempore speech here because of the short time which we have with each group in that course. In order to make what we think is the best use of the time of the college student in that course, we are presenting the theory by means of a few concentrated lectures."¹

Hence, each instructor was allowed to present the course by his own method and direction, injecting his own personality and philosophy into the basic speech course.

The basic speech course as presented under Dr. Hill, had a public speaking emphasis with the majority of class time spent in actual practice.

"The greater part of our time is given over to practice and criticism. As a matter of course, practice is far and away the most important part of public speaking training. If there has to be a sacrifice in any direction, I should always suggest sacrifice of text work in favor of actual practice. Public Speaking is an art, although it has a certain science side. The theory is reasonably simple, but the practice is essential."²

The course at this time, 1930, was a two-credit one and was offered on a semester basis with class being held twice a week. It was required of all students in the schools of Engineering, General Science and Commerce. In 1945, college president, Milton Eisenhower, made the course a graduation requirement in all curriculums. The course was then called Oral Communications III.

¹Personal letter written by Dr. H. T. Hill to Eulalia Nevins, High School teacher at Dodge City, Kansas, March 21, 1930.

²Ibid., 1930.

The course was set up in such a way as to give each student all the speaking experience he could possibly get in one semester. The students' speeches were primarily extemporaneous on various topics, presented before different types of audiences. In the course of one semester, the student would give from five to nine speeches ranging from simple two-minute self-introductions to ten minute "formal" presentations. To cite an example of the diversity of audience, topic, and presentation of speech required in this course, a student would be required on one occasion to speak on a topic of his own choosing to a pretended group of farmers and on another occasion, he was required to speak before an audience composed of college students on topics such as "America's Military Power" or "Causes of the Sino-Japanese Dispute in Manchuria".

Generally the purpose of all the required speeches was to secure action or to inform; seldom was entertainment the purpose. The instructors "...did not stress the significance of the topic the students spoke on in trying to get them up to speak."¹ One would assume that in accordance with the purpose of the course, stress was placed upon effective presentation--whatever the topic might be.

Often times the students before speaking, was required to submit an outline. The outline was to include the following points:

- "1. Title of speech
2. Occasion
3. Nature of audience
4. Attitude of audience
5. Purpose
6. Central Idea

¹Interview: Professor K. Given, May 28, 1965.

7. Introduction
8. Outline proper
9. Conclusion
10. Bibliography"¹

This outline submitted to the instructor preceeding the student's speech, would, in most cases, serve as the student's criticism sheet. This was the only written assignment that the student had to fulfill and it was not graded.

When lectures and reading assignments were given, they would generally cover the following areas regarding speech:

"Delivery and conversational quality
 Subject
 Purpose
 Statement of aim
 Central idea
 Speech construction
 Reference to experience
 Culmination
 Interest and attention
 Action and gesture
 Appeal to motives
 Persuasion"²

The instructor usually tried to fit these points of instruction into the criticism of speeches, since lecture times was limited.

Tests that were given generally covered the reading assignments. Questions asked by Harrison B. Summer are cited here and are typical of test questions of most other instructors:

"Give the essentials of a good speech subject. Name the seven impelling motives listed by Phillips. Give three methods by which the speaker may link up his idea directly with the interest of the audience."³

¹Extempore Speaking Syllabus, Prepared for use in classes in Extempore Speaking I, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, 1931, 14.

²Extempore Speaking Syllabus, p. 17.

³Test questions for Extempore I, Harrison B. Summer, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, 1931.

The following books were used as text when the instructors found it necessary to assign reading for additional instruction:

<u>The Spoken Word</u>	W. N. Briggance
<u>Influencing Behavior Through Speech</u>	H. H. Higgins
<u>Effective Speaking</u>	E. E. Phillips
<u>Business and Professional Speaking</u>	W. P. Sanford & W. H. Yeager
<u>Public Speaking</u>	J. A. Winan
<u>Fundamentals of Speech</u> (Revised)	C. H. Woolbert
<u>First Principles of Speech Making</u>	Dorsey, Avery, and Sickel

This, then, was the structure of the basic speech course at Kansas State from 1915 to 1954, under Dr. Howard T. Hill. The course was a practical public speaking "skills" course for two credits. It was offered on a semester basis with the majority of time and emphasis being placed on practice. The instructors were free to develop the course as they pleased in an effort to be effective to the student's needs, and to the courses' objectives. Reading assignments were required on a minimal basis to afford the student an opportunity to read about the theory since class time was spent in practice. Originally, the course was required only of those students in specific curriculums but after 1945, the course became a graduation requirement for students in all schools of the college. The course offered from 1915 to 1954 was concerned primarily with giving the student as much speaking practice as was possible in the course's time period. Speaking was stressed far more than was subject matter in speeches required. Practice was essential to theory, lectures being given occasionally and generally only to illustrate a point not available to the student through the text or instructorial criticisms or suggestions.

In the years 1954 to 1960, the basic speech course as presented at Kansas State, slowly started to change in its emphasis, structure and objectives. Realizing that the average student needed training in speech

areas not of a "speech-making" nature but of a nature suited to more practical speaking situations in "every-day" speaking or communicating, the basic course was changed to Oral Communication I. Dr. John Keltner was head of the Department from 1956 to 1958; it was under his direction and Dr. Norma Bunton's (1956-1960) efforts that a graduate developmental process took shape in the basic course with stress on communication.

The general aim of the course at this time was:

"...to enable the student to express himself effectively in real life situations."¹

The aim was clear but the method of achievement was not. According to Dr. Keltner, "...it was very difficult to standardize the course because of widely divergent skills, philosophies and purposes of the teacher."²

In 1957, the basic course committee submitted the following as suggested objectives of Oral Communications I:

- "1. Achievement of adequacy of voice, vocalization, fluency, vocabulary building, organization and development of ideas; and poise -- mental and physical, in oral communication situations.
2. Individual student recognition of his obligations to society to reach a level of adequacy in oral communication situations.
3. Individual student recognition of his obligation to himself to reach a level of adequacy in oral communication situations."³

¹General Aims and Objectives of the Basic Speech Course at KSA, developed by the basic course committee, 1956.

²Personal letter received from Dr. John Keltner, Department Head, 1956-59, Received July 17, 1965.

³Committee suggestions for tentative syllabus in Oral Communications I, 1957.

From a syllabus¹ of the first nine weeks of the course, which was offered on a semester basis, the following general course outline can be made:

I. Speeches

- A. The student was required to give one speech per week.
- B. Six of these speeches required outlines either in brief or sentence form according to specifications made for each speech.
- C. Speeches were presented by the student to:
 - 1. State a belief
 - 2. Rank factors
 - 3. Present an opinion
 - 4. Explain something
 - 5. Inform
 - 6. Clarify
 - 7. Present a discussion
 - 8. Inspire, stimulate or persuade
 - 9. Demonstrate

A list of specific areas under each heading from which the student could choose was included in the syllabus.

For certain of these speeches, the class was divided into two groups, each group choosing from different lists of choices.

II. Lectures

- A. Lectures were given under the following headings:
 - 1. On Making an Outline
 - 2. Factors of Interest and The Speech to Inform
 - 3. Delivery: Mental and Physical Poise
 - 4. Preparation for Committee Participation
 - 5. Forms of Support in a Speech
- B. Each Lecture was followed by a discussion session

Because no other information is available at this time regarding this particular course structure one must assume that the latter nine weeks

¹Information given here is taken from a nine week syllabus of course, "Introduction to Public Speaking", 1957.

of the semester were spent in writing and analyzing. This assumption is based on the statement:

"To characterize the change from Speech to Communications we started to reduce the amount of speaking and increase the amount of writing and analysis. Concerned with the elements of actual communication rather than the skill in delivery."¹

The first significant changes in the course since 1957, came in 1960, with the selection of Dr. Terry Welden as coordinator of the basic course. With the aid of Dr. Bunton and the Oral Communication I committee, Dr. Welden standardized the basic course regarding method of teaching and course content. To move toward uniformity in presentation of the course, faculty seminars were instituted, meeting in both the fall and spring semesters of each school year. An Instructor's Guide² and detailed class syllabus were distributed to each faculty member. The syllabi contained a discussion of the text to be used in the course, Fundamentals of Public Speaking.³ It also contained detail as to what was to be done in the course. No longer was the content of the course left entirely to the discretion or philosophies of the individual instructors as they had been under Dr. Howard T. Hill from 1915 to 1954.

The emphasis of the course continued in its change toward a communications approach. The purpose of the course was three-fold:

¹Personal interview with Dr. Norma Bunton, conducted on April 11, 1966. Dr. Bunton has taught the basic course since 1956. She became Department Head in 1960.

²Instructor's Guide, Oral Communications I and IA, Department of Speech, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, 1960.

³Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Fundamentals of Public Speaking, 3rd edition.

- "1. An understanding of the fundamentals of human communications
2. An opportunity for speech performance
3. An awareness of appropriate speech content for a given audience."¹

The structure of the course from 1960 to 1963, was such that each student was required to give five speeches during the semester; the purpose of these speech assignments was to help the student understand the communication process. In an attempt to improve the content of the speeches, beginning in 1962, three speech topics had to be chosen from a supplementary text entitled Ideas that Matter by Thonssen and Finkel.² To help the student with speech organization, four of the five speech assignments required written full speech-content outline. The course utilized classical speech models by having the students analyze them for content and form. This was required of the students given the department's realization that:

"The ability to analyze and synthesize the manuscripts of speeches presented by responsible public figures correlates highly with the ability to incorporate sound organization and support into one's own written and oral messages."³

During the semester an average of five written assignments was required of each student.

According to the syllabus, the lectures and readings emphasized: "selecting a topic, use of amplification, use of quotations, relating the topic to the audience and insight into the background of the

¹Instructor's Guide, 1960.

²Lester Thonssen and William L. Finkel, Ideas that Matter, New York, 1961.

³Instructor's Guide, 1960.

audience, organization, transitions, logic and also content."¹ Special emphasis was placed on preparing an outline and its logical development. Throughout the semester, there was a "...deliberate integration of the fundamentals or oral and written communication."²

In 1963, Dr. Welden divided the basic course into two equal sections of emphasis. During the first eight weeks the student was lectured on the theory of communications and the second eight weeks were spent in practice sessions.

Because of increasing enrollment and the need to make more efficient use of class time and faculty members, the fall semester of 1964-65, necessitated the establishment of a new program for teaching the basic speech course. In the new program "twenty-four sections of Oral Comm I combine into six groups for mass lecture sessions on Mondays and Tuesdays and split into smaller recitation groups later during the week."³ With this structure one-half of the course was theory and the other half was practice. The mass lectures were handled by Dr. Terry Welden and Dr. Donald Darnell while the recitation sections were taught by graduate assistants.

The course was at this time committed to teaching "...the fundamental communication principles that underlie many communication situations, including but not restricted to traditional platform speaking."⁴

¹Instructor's Guide, 1960.

²Robert Ethridge, April 10, 1966. Mr. Ethridge taught the basic course while a Graduate Assistant in Speech, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.

³Dr. Terry Welden, "A More Effective Program," Kansas State University Collegian, March 3, 1965, 1.

⁴Dr. Terry Welden, Oral Communications I, Class Syllabus, 1965.

With this principle in mind, the lectures presented the following areas of instruction:

- Purpose of Communication
- General Structure of Messages
- Elements of the Communication Situation
and Complexity of the Process
- Delivery
- Individual Experiences Determine Communication
- Motivation of Speaker and Audience
- Audience Analysis (Goal Relations)
- Language
- Organization and Outlining
- Evidence and Reasoning
- The Problem of Meaning¹

Usually, each topic was covered in a single lecture period. In the fall of 1965, the Department found it necessary to modify the lecture content.

The lectures covered the following areas:

- Purpose of Communication
- Communication Elements
- Organization and Structure
- Analysis of Behavior
- Delivery
- Language²

In the recitation sections, the sections evaluated speeches presented by the students and reinforced what was covered in the mass lectures. The student was required to present three speeches in class and write two analyses of speeches given in class by other students. For each round of speeches, the students of the section were divided into six groups of four, with each group selecting a topic³ that they would all speak on during the

¹Welden, Syllabus, 1964.

²Dr. Terry Welden, Oral Communications I, Class Syllabus, 1965.

³Topics were selected from a list of fifty topics appearing in the students textbook.

round. Each student gave his own analysis on the speech performances of the other students in his group.

The basic course after 1964, was considered a fundamentals course in oral communication. The lecture content was highly structured since only one or two professors lectured to the students in the mass lecture sections. The syllabus was developed so that it was applicable to the basic course classes that did not fall under the mass lecture set-up. The recitation sections were such that the lecture points were reviewed and made more clear if needed to the student. The course, under the new structure and emphasis moved ahead with the same place and presentation throughout each of basic course sections because all instructors followed the same syllabus.

II. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

It is the purpose of this section to set forth, in text and tabular arrangement, the results of a survey where the basic speech course was evaluated by former instructors. The survey was made by sending questionnaires to all instructors available who had taught the course. Fifty-three questionnaires were mailed out covering the basic course from 1915 to the present, and of this number forty-one were returned with usable information, for a return of seventy-seven per cent.

All the instructors will be anonymous in the data with only the instructor's arrival year stated to give a time context to the data. The results are organized to correspond the way they appeared in the questionnaire.

Replies of Instructors from 1915-1939

1. The basic course in speech served as a service course, adapted to the individual needs and abilities of the student in seven (70%) of the instructor's classrooms. The other three (30%) described the basic course as a survey course in speech.

2. Nine (81%) of the instructors indicated that "75% or more" of their grade computation was based on speech performance. Only one instructor reported that "about 50%" of the grade was based on speech performance. As can be expected from the above data seven (63%) replied that "less than 25%" of the grade came from tests or written assignments.

3. In reply to a question on their aims or objectives for the basic course the respondents supplied a varied collection, among which three (37%) simply reported, training the student in the skill of speaking. The other replies ranged from:

a) "I tried to get my students to be able to think under pressure, speak distinctly, improve vocabulary, organize and think logically, use reliable source material and colorful illustrations". (1928)

b) "The basic goals were organization of speeches, presentation, and originality. Eye contact, audience contact, posture, correct pronunciation were stressed". (1931)

c) "Help young people learn to speak and to act. There was no complicated division into sub-titles of aims and goals." (1920)

Although there is little approaching unanimity of wording for any single objective, it appears that speech organization and presentation were mentioned most often by the respondents.

4.

TABLE 1

Time in the Classroom Spent on Theory and in Practice:

	Theory	Practice
75% or more	<u> </u>	<u>9</u>
50% to 75%	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
About 50%	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
25% to 50%	<u>3</u>	<u> </u>
Less than 25%	<u>6</u>	<u> </u>

The obvious observation from TABLE 1 is that nine (100%) or all of the instructors devoted over "75% or more" of class time in practice. This clearly indicates a skills approach to the basic course.

5. The answers received disclose that the instructors generally did not emphasize any specific criteria in selecting speaking topics. Five (55%) indicated that they had no criteria or restrictions for the student in selecting speaking topics. Those instructor's responses indicating that they had restrictions ranging from: "the student selected his own with what consultation with the instructor he desired. Otherwise, instructions were generalized, and calculated to stimulate the student's imagination to the possibilities open to him." (1915) "Take a subject that is interesting to you." (1920)

5b. Those respondents who indicated that they had restrictions were asked to describe the procedure used in selecting topics. Their responses ranged from, "we had a list of eight types of speeches given to us. My suggestion was that they talk about something they knew about," (1937) to, "The course started with easy to prepare personal assignments such as introduction of self, pet peeves, things I like to do, etc. and progressed to material problems, universal problems which required research and documentation." (1928) It appears that the problem of topic selecting was solved simply by letting the student speak on a topic of his choice. This along with the previous data indicates that the instructor's primary job was in getting the student on his feet to speak.

6. Dealing with the type of speech given in the classroom two (20%) said they used all five types mentioned in the questionnaire, (entertain, persuade, inspire, actuate and inform). The respondents that did not use all of the speech types mentioned the following as being used:

TABLE 2

Frequency of Speeches Given in Class

Inform	6
Persuade	5
Entertain	2
Inspire	1
Actuate	1

The two most used types appear to be the speech to inform and to persuade.

6b. Eight (80%) of the respondents replied that "extemporaneous" speaking was the form of presentation used most often in the classroom. Their responses ranged from, "Always extemporaneous, scripts and notes discouraged," (1937) to, "Extemporaneous, because this form best adapted to future uses of speech by the student." (1921)

TABLE 3

Relative Importance of the Following Fundamentals
Commonly Covered in a Basic Speech Course

Fundamentals	Have. Emph. 5	Gen. Emph. 4	Just Covered 3	Gen. Not Covered 2	Intent Not Covered 1	Mean Value	Rank
Phy. Presentation	1	2	5	0	1	3.44	8
Supporting Material	5	2	0	1	0	4.38	5
Oral Presentation	6	2	1	0	0	4.56	3
Research & Preparation	4	5	0	0	0	4.44	4
Outline Form	3	3	3	0	0	4.00	7
Organization	9	0	0	0	0	5.00	1
Gaining Self Confidence	7	1	0	0	0	4.88	2
Audience Orientation	4	3	2	0	0	4.22	6

From the data in TABLE 3 it appears that organization, nine (100%); and gaining self confidence, seven (77%) were the most "heavily emphasized" fundamentals. On the other hand, only one fundamental does not fit into either of the "emphasized" categories, that being physical presentation, which five (55%) respondents said they "just covered." Looking at the mean values in TABLE 3 the remaining five fundamentals were almost equally "emphasized" in the classroom.

7. Finally, the instructors were asked to report how the job of speech criticism was handled in the basic course. Six (66%) indicated that the class did the majority of the criticizing. Other instructor's statements ranged from:

- a) "I never wrote out a criticism for a speech. I gave oral criticism of each speech supplemented by a general call to the class for additional oral criticism." (1920)
- b) "Individual class members with help from the rest of class and instructor." (1937)
- c) "The outline was submitted to me prior to the presentation. I wrote criticisms on the outline then returned the outline and speech to the student. The outline and speech both received grades. At the close of the period I made general criticisms." (1931)

Replies of the Instructors from 1940-1959

1. In response to the question asking for a description of the basic course as they taught it, eight (44%) listed the course as a service course for the students. There is slight agreement after the first description with four (22%) describing the course as a survey course while another three (15%) looked at the basic course as a specialized performance course. Finally, three (15%) saw fit to describe the course in their own words. A representative statement was "Introduction to basic speaking skills." (1946)

2. Eleven (61%) of the instructors based "75% or more" of their grade computation on "speech performance" while another four (22%) based "50% to 75%" "speech performance." The evidence indicates that the course was a skills course in most cases with little time for anything else.

3. In response to the question on their goals or objectives of the basic course the instructors supplied a varied number of general goals. There is little similarity in the wording except for six (33%) who indicated that their goal was simply to give the individual speaking experience. Other goals reported were to gain self confidence; such as, "To get the student to overcome nervousness, appreciate the value of an outline, not to 'meander around' but to keep to the subject matter and know when to stop." (1945) Another goal was to make the student aware of communicating effectively through better organization and presentation.

"The basic goals of the course were development of the ability to communicate orally with others by practice in organizing thought and in presenting those thoughts effectively to a group," (1946)

"Speaking experience was the primary goal. The first objective was to eliminate excess stage fright. My presentation leaned a bit heavily on the effective communication side, although organization and point development were also stressed." (1946)

"Concepts of organization, supporting materials, audience analysis and delivery were explored to enable students to 'effectively communicate' in a public speaking situation." (1946)

Finally, some instructors simply saw the course as a way of helping the student. "The emphasis was on helping the individual student apply practical knowledge in speech. We worked on overcoming slovenly habits, monotonous or unpleasant voice, tired words, blurred sounds, grammatical mistakes, etc." (1947) and "On the basis of individuals needs and improvement of his performance in the speech arts in respect to delivery." (1942) The

four most commonly mentioned goals of the course were to give the student speaking experience, to help him with self confidence, to make him aware of organization and presentation and to help him with any speaking needs he might have.

4.

TABLE 4

Time in the Classroom Spent on Theory and in Practice

	Theory	Practice
75% or more	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>
50% to 75%	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
About 50%	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
25% to 50%	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
Less than 25%	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>

The data from TABLE 4 indicate that although there is not complete agreement on the divisions of time in the classroom, there appears to be two distinct groups. Eight (47%) spent "75% or more" of class time in "practice" while another seven (41%) devoted "50% to 75%" to "practice." Regarding the amount of theory in the classroom the same percentages held true, with eight (47%) spending "less than 25%" and seven (41%) devoting "25% to 50%" "To theory." Basically, the course was still considered a skills course although there is evidence of instructors devoting more time to theory.

5. Sixteen (88%) of the instructors indicated that they had criteria or restriction for selecting topics. Their criteria ranged from: "Only that subjects be handled within the bounds of good taste (mine) and could be

developed within time limit (5 minutes). (1946) "Significance, audience value, stimulative quality." (1952) "The major criteria was audience suitability, thus eliminating anything too simple, too difficult, or off-color." (1946)

5a. The instructors were then asked to describe the procedure used in selecting topics. The procedures varied as follows:

- a) "Teacher-pupil conferences, especially for anyone with choice difficulties." (1947)
- b) "Students were encouraged to speak on topics fitting their knowledge and experiences or on topics about which they felt strongly and in which they desired to do research." (1942)
- c) "Prior to use of Ideas That Matter sourcebook,¹ students chose their own topics unaided. After the adoption of the source book, they were to use a topic from it or another topic of the same general level of significance." (1957)

From the responses it appears that the instructor's imposed some sort of criteria or restrictions on topic selection. The most mentioned limitations were appropriateness to the audience and interestingness.

6. The instructors were asked what types of speeches were given in their class and the following frequency table was built from the data.

TABLE 5

Frequency of Speeches Given in Class

Persuade	21 ^a
Inform	15
Entertain	5
Inspire	4
Introduction	2
Explain	1

^aThis includes speeches to affect, to sell, to actuate and to convince.

¹Lester Thonssen and William L. Finkel, Sourcebook for Speakers: Ideas That Matter, (New York) 1961.

Representative statements ranged from:

- a) "To inform (with use of visual aids--graphs, charts etc. but no use of blackboards), to inspire, to persuade or actuate, a combination of any of the above three, to entertain--if class small enough, manuscript reading." (1945)
- b) "Informative speeches were assigned first with emphasis on blackboard techniques (for relaxation) and gestures. Speeches to persuade or actuate came later with emphasis on voice and organization and development." (1946)
- c) "Since the course was originally designed for the student who had little or no background in speaking situations as many types of speeches as possible were used." (1942)

The two most emphasized types of speeches in the basic course were the speech to persuade and inform.

6b. Extemporaneous speaking was mentioned by eleven (61%) of the instructors as the form of presentation emphasized in the classroom. A typical response was, "extemporaneous naturally, oral reading being a specialized skill, memorized a waste of time, and impromptu a useful challenge but rarely dependable technique." (1947) The remaining seven (39%) indicated that they used other types of presentation besides extemporaneous. Their responses ranged from:

- a) "Speeches ran from extemporaneous to memorized. No script work was done, pupils were encouraged to work from an outline but to present a practiced speech." (1950)
- b) "We stressed speaking from a prepared outline--discouraged writing an entire script, because we felt that the student in this way developed the habit of thought organization while avoiding being tied to specific words and phrases." (1946)
- c) "We used extemporaneous once--impromptu occasionally but prepared speeches were predominantly in the assignments." (1947)

Even with the other forms of presentation the basic form used most often was the extemporaneous form. However, judging from the other responses there was wide variance regarding the other forms of presentation used in the classroom.

7.

TABLE 6

Relative Importance of the Following Fundamentals
Commonly Covered in a Basic Speech Course

Fundamentals	Heav. Emph. 5	Gen. Emph. 4	Just Covered 3	Gen Not Covered 2	Intent Not Covered 1	Mean Value	Rank
Phy. Presentation	0	9	7	1	0	3.47	8
Supporting Material	12	5	0	0	0	4.70	3
Oral Presentation	5	8	4	0	0	4.05	7
Research & Preparation	13	4	0	0	0	4.76	2
Outline Form	6	11	0	0	0	4.35	4.5
Organization	15	2	0	0	0	4.88	1
Gaining Self Confidence	7	9	1	0	0	4.35	4.5
Audience Orientation	9	8	0	0	0	4.24	6

The data from TABLE 6 indicates that all the fundamentals were either "Heavily Emphasized" or "Generally Emphasized," except for one. The fundamental that failed to follow this pattern completely, was physical presentation which nine (52%) of the instructors "Generally Emphasized" and seven (41%) "just covered" in the classroom. From the responses, organization, fifteen (88%); research and preparation, thirteen (76%); and supporting material, twelve (70%) were the most "heavily emphasized" fundamentals in the basic course. Again, the mean values of the remaining five fundamentals indicates close agreement on how they were "emphasized" in the basic course.

8. Finally, the instructors were asked how the job of criticizing was handled in their classes. From the responses there seems to be three distinct methods used in criticizing. Six (33%) mentioned that oral criticism

was given by both the instructor and the class. The responses ranged from: "The teacher made classroom criticism, hoping for a majority of the constructive type. The class as a whole criticized." (1946) to, "I usually led a class discussion during which students (at times designated, at others not) and I contributed criticism." (1957). Five (27%) indicated that the job of criticizing was usually done by the instructor and written only. Another five (27%) said that written criticism was mostly done by the students. A representative statement: "I always evaluated their speeches aloud. Toward the end of the semester three students were assigned to each speaker for that day to give written criticism." (1947)

Replies of Instructors from 1960 to present

1. Six (44%) respondents saw the basic course as being something other than a survey course, specialized performance or service course. Representative answers ranged from: "A study of the principles and the process of Oral communications with an emphasis on face-to-face communications for effect." (1960) and "to teach the appreciation of oral literature as well as to teach students (on an individual basis) to speak." (1962). Five (35%) saw the course as a survey course in speech while the remaining three (21%) saw it as a service course for the student.

2. In computing grades, nine (66%) replied that from "25% to 50%" of the student's grade was based on "speech performance." Four (28%) instructors based "about 50%" of the grade on speech performance while three (21%) indicated that "50% to 75%" came from the student's performance. On the other hand, thirteen (92%) of the responses based "25% to 50%" of the grade on tests and written assignments. The data indicates that the course emphasis was beginning to be equally distributed between performance and tests on written assignments.

3. Ten (71%) responses indicated that their aim or goal in the basic course was simply to teach the student the fundamentals of oral communications. Specific answers ranged from, "to change the student's focus from his own performance to the audience's needs and wants and the task of affecting somebody rather than looking pretty." (1962) to, "acquaint all students at the University with the principles of oral communication and provide a laboratory for the application of these in front of an audience." (1963). Another, three (21%) said that their aim or goal was to teach or help the student develop speech skills. The general goal or aim was to teach the student the principles of oral communications.

4.

TABLE 7

Time in the Classroom Spent on Theory and in Practice

	Theory	Practice
75%		
75% or more	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
50% to 75%	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
About 50%	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>
25% to 50%	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Less than 25%	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>

The data from Table 7 indicates that the dominant pattern on how the time was spent in the classroom was almost equally divided between theory and practice. Nine (66%) devoted "about 50%" to theory and two (14%) spent from "50% to 75%" on theory while another two (14%) spent from "25% to 50%." The same is almost true of practice where eight (57%) devoted "about 50%" of class time and another three (21%) spent "50% to 75%" on theory.

5. Fourteen (100%) instructors indicated that there were either criteria or restrictions in selecting topics for speeches.

5b. The procedure used in selecting topics appears to have been one of two methods. These instructors between 1963-64 required a number of the speeches to be selected from Thonssen and Finkel's 'Sourcebook for Speakers: Ideas that matter.' From 1964 all the speech topics were required to come from St. Onges,¹ "Creative Speech."

6. In regard to the type of speech given in the classroom, fourteen (100%) indicated that they used the informative speech most often or all of the time. Six (44%) said that they also had the student give speeches to persuade. The only other type mentioned was the speech to entertain and three (21%) used it in the classroom.

6b. Fourteen (100%) respondents replied that extemporaneous speaking was used most often in the presentation of speeches. A representative statement was "Extemp--because it was thought to be more realistic practice for the real world, and leaves the eyes free to see feedback." (1962)

¹Keith St. Onges, Creative Speech, (California, 1964).

TABLE 8

Relative Importance of the Following Fundamentals
Commonly Covered in a Basic Speech Course

Fundamentals	Heav. Emph. 5	Gen. Emph. 4	Just Covered 3	Gen. Not Covered 2	Intent Not Covered 1	Mean Value	Rank
Phy. Presentation	0	6	8	0	1	3.27	7
Supporting Material	10	5	0	0	0	4.67	1.5
Oral Presentation	2	5	5	2	1	3.33	6
Research & Preparation	5	9	1	0	0	4.27	4
Outline Form	5	4	6	0	0	3.93	5
Organization	10	5	0	0	0	4.67	1.5
Gaining Self Confidence	3	4	2	3	2	3.21	8
Audience Orientation	9	6	0	0	0	4.60	3

From the data in TABLE 8, it appears that organization, ten (71%); supporting material, ten (71%) and audience orientation, nine (66%) were the most "emphasized" fundamental in the classroom. Judging from the mean values, physical presentation; oral presentation, and gaining self confidence were closely valued and appear to have been "generally emphasized" or "just covered" by the instructor.

8. Finally, thirteen (92%) of the responses replied that the job of criticizing was handled by both the teacher and student. The instructor generally gave each student a specific written critique and then made general comments to the class while the students usually gave either oral or written criticisms. After 1964 the student was responsible for writing criticisms on those speeches in his group.

TABLE 9
Comparison of Mean Value and Rank Results
Across Three Time Units

Fundamentals	Group A 1920-39		Group B 1940-59		Group C 1960-	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Phy. Pres.	3.44	8	3.47	8	3.27	7
Supp. Material	4.38	5	4.70	3	4.67	1.5
O. Presentation	4.56	3	4.05	7	3.33	6
Research & Prop.	4.44	4	4.76	2	4.27	4
Outline Form	4.00	7	4.35	4.5	3.93	5
Organiz.	5.00	1	4.88	1	4.67	1.5
G. Self. Conf.	4.88	2	4.35	4.5	3.21	8
Aud. Orien.	4.22	6	4.24	6	4.60	3

The Spearman r (rho) Test for the correlation of ranking coefficients was used to check the fundamental rankings between the different time periods. This was essential if any comparisons were to be made based on the rankings of the time periods.

The coefficient of correlation (r) between the rankings based on the mean values from Group A and mean values from Group B was .614.

The second comparison was that of the rankings based on the mean value from group A and group C. The coefficient of correlation in this test was .268.

The third Spearman Test of Correlation was used to compare the rankings based on the mean values of group B and group C. The coefficient of correlation achieved in this test was .647.

¹Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, The Table of Critical Values of r_s , "The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient," (New York, 1956), p. 284.

III. History of the Basic Speech Course at other Universities

Trying to focus on speech instruction during the period 1860 to 1890 is difficult because speech was a scattered, almost neglected subject at most schools. During this period it was not even considered an academic area.¹ However, the student who was interested in gaining speaking experience usually was able to participate in college speaking exercises. The exercises were usually the responsibility of a faculty member who had had some speaking experience. In some cases, students would receive training in the spoken word from private elocution schools or from traveling, fee-charging elocutionists.

The emphasis of instruction was placed on the preparation and delivery of declamations, reading poetry, and reciting classical orations. The student usually worked in drill sessions with the instructor, with the drills concentrating on development of the voice and learning to control the body. "It was common to teach gymnastics to develop health, vigor, and freedom. To teach position, that is walking and standing; movements of the hand, arms, and legs in conversation, oratorical, and dramatic gestures."² The basis for this emphasis was that "real education" did not consist in acquiring only facts; it consisted in acquiring skill in execution.

The general purpose of speech education during this period was

¹Giles W. Gray, "The Private Schools of Speech," ed. Karl Wallace, The History of Speech Education in America (New York: 1954), p. 322.

²Ibid.

widely viewed as being practical training for specific vocational groups. Thus, it was the would-be lawyer, teacher, actor, politician, minister or platform reader taking speech instruction. It was assumed that through these exercises the student would become more articulate and flexible with his voice and show greater control over his bodily movements. At this time there was little concern for the average student and his interests and problems.

It was during the closing decade of the nineteenth century that the slow evolution of academic departments became noticeable on the university scene. This was felt all across the land as a general revision of the educational system began. "Departmentalism resulted from the vast expansion of higher education during the nineteenth century and the still novel concept that useful or practical knowledge was suitable to higher learning."¹ From this came the effort by many universities to provide their departments and courses with the ability to cope with the needs and aspirations of all the citizens of the state. As for speech instruction it was "not until the 20th century that the impact of science and utilitarianism, of student interest and curriculum specialization begin fully to be realized..."²

Turning our attention now to the history of the basic speech course in the twentieth century, a review of the literature reflects its diversity and varied trends of emphasis. In 1918, Houghton observed: "It appears that in each institution, the beginning course as it is now offered, has

¹Donald K. Smith, "Origin and Development of Departments of Speech", ed. Karl Wallace, The History of Speech Education in America (New York 1954) p. 448.

²Ibid., p. 450.

in nearly every instance been shaped to meet a local need or demand, so that at the present time there are almost as many different courses as there are institutions offering them."¹ However, four general trends in speech instruction were visible amid the various individualistic approaches to speech training during the century.

The first trend was a carry-over from the previous century and remained popular until the 1920's. This, of course, was the elocution emphasis taught in the beginning speech course. In an effort to preserve the usefulness of elocution, Thomas C. Trueblood and Robert I. Fulton changed the approach from drilling the professional reader to training the university student in delivery. The student was drilled in the principles of delivery, which consisted of training the voice to reflect emotion and the development of bodily control. The drills usually consisted of short memorized extracts from orations. In many cases the teacher would spend some time demonstrating for the class the "correct" way to speak or read.

With the coming of Charles H. Woolbert in 1920, elocution took on a more sophisticated title when he called his basic course at the University of Illinois, "Principles in Expression." Woolbert, who approached public speaking as a behaviorist, believed that in the fundamentals course attention should be paid to the fundamental elements of behavior, voice and action. Thus, the student was drilled in voice quality, force, pitch, and time beside body development. Woolbert believed that the student needed to learn control over bodily action not only because meanings are read

¹Houghton, loc. cit., p. 150.

through the speaker's movements, but because effectiveness of delivery made effective communication of thought possible.¹

Another trend in speech instruction appeared to represent the general movement toward the establishment of practical college courses to help the citizens of the state with their problems and aspirations. This was the public speaking course where the student gave mostly extemporaneous speeches in trying to develop a natural style of speaking. At some schools "extempore speaking was taken as the only legitimate goal of speech instruction and most instructors refused to even use memorized selections as classroom exercises."² This emphasis appeared to pick up popularity after the Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking was formed in 1914.

The first charter of the Association was an attempt to move Speech instruction away from the elocution emphasis and toward a practical speaking emphasis. "A speech of any kind was something more than a written theme or report repeated orally; they understood a public speech as practical; systematic communications whose ideas, organization, style, and presentation were a product of the speaker, his subject, his audience and occasion."³ A leader of the practical conversational approach was James A. Winans at Cornell College, New York. In 1900, he replaced a declamation approach with one emphasizing practical public speaking oriented toward the students in the classroom. In general terms the course would

¹Donald Hayworth, "A Search for Facts on the Teaching of Public Speaking," Quart. Journ. Speech, XXVII, (1941) 40.

²Ibid., p. 40.

³Frank M. Rarig and Halbert S. Greaves, "National Speech Associations and Speech Education," ed. Karl Wallace, Speech Education in America (New York) 1954, 502.

begin with short informal speeches and then proceed to longer ones, with an occasional declamation thrown in to help the student with his voice development. However, Winans played down the importance of delivery.

A third trend, and one that was quite different from the previous two, was started at the University of Minnesota in 1927. Here the emphasis was placed on a mental-hygiene approach that would help the student adjust to society and to his needs and problems. It was Morse's belief that many of the fundamental courses were too uniform for all students¹ that is, they usually included a speech to entertain, to convince, to welcome, and so forth. The instructor would then check off each exercise as it was completed, and forget the speech and any problems that may have existed. This trend looked at the classroom as a laboratory where the teacher could work with individual problems and try to develop better behavior patterns within the student.¹

This approach gained support during the 1930's. It's proponents saw little good in forcing the student with a behavioral problem to be drilled in front of a class on one of his weaknesses, thus embarrassing him. They felt the need to investigate the personality of the student, and then assign exercises that would help him overcome his shortcomings. This approach, clearly, was in opposition to the other trends emphasizing public speaking and delivery and above all some form of drilling the student.

The mental-hygiene approach gained in popularity during the 30's for another reason. Its proponents noticed that the average student

¹Morse, loc. cit., p. 543.

entering college did not suffer from any serious voice problems and actually had little trouble talking to his friends one at a time or in groups. To them the course had to be more than just a public speaking class. It became a course that was concerned with developing the character of the student by making him aware of his personality and the behavior of others in his social environment. The student was still told about the use of voice and body control, but their application was now based on and co-ordinated with the student's social and psychological development. The course was built on a broad basis of training for personality integration, social adjustment, and an understanding of the nature of language and language skills.¹

The fourth general trend developed during the late thirties and early forties when some schools took the mental-hygiene approach and fused it with the beginning course in English, while other schools combined speech and English courses. In either case the new courses were called communication or communication skills courses. This new emphasis was an effort to help the student improve his ability to read and listen as well as to speak and write. One of the leaders of this approach was Elwood Murray at Denver University. The course at Denver University tried to give the student a general education in communicating which would help him adjust to society. The student would give talks on his desired vocation and participate in discussion groups presenting pros and cons of various vocations, among other things.

Other schools that developed communications approaches during the

¹Herold Lillywhite, "A Re-evaluation of Speech Objectives," Quart. Journ. Speech, XXXIII, (1947) 506.

1940's, unlike Murray's and more toward the communication skills trend, were the University of Iowa, Minnesota and Northwestern. In these courses the emphasis appeared to be on practice in speaking, writing, listening and reading, with nothing said about the student's vocation. The general approach was away from exhibitionism and more toward communicating with society and winning a desired response.

The general trends outlined here, of course, are only those published throughout the years and covered in the review of the literature. There is no way of knowing what other approaches were tried, but never reported. Some schools tried combining different approaches while other schools held to a single approach, and so it went. As stated before, diversity was characteristic of the basic speech course.

Returning to the review of the literature and the various surveys made regarding the basic course, the following points are of interest. During the 1920's the aims of the basic course seemed to be practical in scope, or at least there was a general drift in that direction. From the Fritz survey the four most common course objectives were: learn to gather and arrange material for speeches, learn to speak with freedom, force and ease, remove fear and self consciousness, and correct faults of voice and speech.¹ Almost twenty years later in the Stebbins Survey the four most common aims were: learn to participate in everyday speaking situations, improve voice and diction in everyday use, speak effectively from the platform, and eliminate speech defects and faults.² From the Hargis study done in 1956, the four most common objectives were to: help the student develop self-confidence and poise, provide practice in

¹Fritz, loc. cit., p. 33.

²Stebbins, loc. cit., p. 93.

effective oral expression, provide practice and instruction in speech delivery, and develop effective voice and diction methods.¹ In a 1963 survey by London, the goals outlined were: provide instruction and practice in extemporaneous speaking, diction instruction and voice improvement.²

¹Hargis, loc. cit., p. 32.

²London, loc. cit., p. 175.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE STUDY

I. Conclusions from the Historical Overview

It can be concluded from examining the historical overview of speech education at Kansas State University, and more specifically the basic speech course after its development, that there exists an administrative influence and a course leader influence. Prior to the establishment of a basic speech course in 1920, speech education existed in a variety of forms on the campus. Looking at the 1874 college handbook, the administration considered communicating effectively to be important to the successful citizen. In fact, from 1879 until 1912, all students were required to complete a speech program of three courses and two chapel recitals before graduation. It was also an administrative decision to drop the requirement after 1912, and it was not until 1945 when President Milton Eisenhower, who was in favor of formal training in public speaking, reinstated the requirement of the speech course for all students. After the University-wide requirement was abandoned in 1912, it was up to the individual departments to decide who should take the basic course; thus students in Agriculture did not have to take the course while the Engineering and business students were required to take the basic course.

The other influence is more noticeable and appeared whenever someone was replaced in directing the basic speech course. From 1915 to 1954, the basic course remained constant in structure and emphasis while Dr. Howard T. Hill was responsible for it as the Department Head. The course was

basically a public speaking course designed to give the student as much speaking experience as possible in the two hours a week the course met. Dr. Hill believed that practice was essential to becoming an effective speaker, and so the structure of the course emphasized practice while a minimum of theory was presented to the student in a few concentrated lectures. Dr. Hill also felt that the basic course should reflect the individual instructor's personality and own philosophy, so the basic course was taught on an individual basis with each instructor having the freedom to go in his own direction. After 1954, Dr. Norma Bunton became responsible for the basic course and slowly started to change the course into one with a communications approach. The emphasis, which had previously centered on practice and speaking, started to shift to a more equalspeaking and analyzing approach. This exemplifies Dr. Bunton's rhetorical background and her conviction that writing is also fundamental to the basic course. After 1960, Dr. Terry Welden became course coordinator and continued to develop the communication approach. Under Dr. Welden's development the basic course became a departmental course with a common syllabus that could be used in all sections of the course. To further strengthen this unified approach the mass lecture-recitation system was established to handle the majority of students. Also, it was Dr. Welden's philosophy that theory was just as important as practice, and now the basic course has a fifty-fifty division between communication theory and speech and writing practice. The communication fundamentals approach represents the communication emphasis he was exposed to while in graduate school at Michigan State University. "

A further conclusion, and one that may be obvious, is that the

basic speech course at Kansas State University changed significantly in structure and emphasis only after 1954.

II. Conclusions from the Instructor Evaluations

It can be concluded from examining the individual questionnaires representing three time periods (1915-39, 1940-59 and 1960-) that there existed a great deal of similarity in what was done in the basic course throughout the period 1915-1959. This is especially interesting because it was during these years that the basic course was taught on an individual instructor basis without overall departmental unification. It appears that the reason for this similarity over the years was due to the type of course being taught. With a basic course and the teaching of the speech fundamentals," the fundamentals remain basically the same although their labels may change over the years. The greatest variation in responses came in the course descriptions where a little more than half of the instructors replied that they taught a service course for the student, another fourth replied that their course was a survey course in speech, and the remaining instructors saw the course as a specialized performance course.

It may be further concluded from the data that the fundamentals emphasized in the classroom remained similar when comparing adjacent time periods, i.e., 1915-39 and 1940-59, and then 1940-59 and 1960-present. This is somewhat surprising in the second comparison (1940-59 with 1960-present) because a change in course structure and emphasis occurred after 1960. Again it appears that when dealing with the basic course such things as fundamentals remain constant over the years.

It is apparent that the basic speech course emphasized practice and performance from 1915 to 1959. Over three-fourths of the replies indicated that they spent "75% or more" of the class time in practice and based "75% or more" of the student's grade on speech performance. After 1960, the course changed and became a fundamentals course with equal time spent on theory and practice in the classroom and the student's grade coming from several tests of content as well as speech performance.

The data indicate that the basic course changed after 1960 regarding structure and emphasis. However, the course still exhibited a number of similarities to the previous period. Thus, the course reflected the philosophy of the coordinator in those areas that were most easily influenced by individual philosophies, such as course approach and course structure. Outside of this, the basic speech course was built from a number of fundamentals that have remained basically the same.

III. A Comparison of the Basic Speech Course at KSU and What Was Happening Across the Nation.

Even before 1920, and the establishment of a single basic speech course at Kansas State University, speech education existed on the campus almost from the schools beginning. In the earliest period students received training from an instructor who had had some speaking experience. The student presented declamations and orations. This resembled what was happening across the nation until almost the second decade of the Twentieth century.

The review of the literature revealed that the basic speech course across the nation developed from four general trends, with each school

inserting its own uniqueness to meet the needs of the students in their locale. The most common trend was the public speaking approach, which can be described as follows: the public speaking approach emphasizes practice over theory and the aim of the course was to help the student learn to prepare a speech and then deliver it. The assumption is that this should eventually build his self-confidence and poise in speaking before other people. Typically the semester starts with the student giving short speeches, usually in extemporaneous form, and then advancing to longer speeches, usually on topics he has chosen. The most common structure is for practice to be stressed over theory. The course of ten covered speech composition, speech delivery, audience analysis and voice and diction.

Judging from the historical overview and the questionnaire analysis, the basic speech course at Kansas State University from 1915 to 1959 appears to have been very similar to the general public speaking skills trend. The literature indicates that there were other trends, but the most popular was the public speaking skills trend and it still remains the most popular today.

After 1960, and especially in 1964, the basic speech course at Kansas State University was changed in structure and emphasis. The course established a mass lecture recitation structured with a fifty-fifty emphasis on theory and practice. The emphasis as of this writing follows a communication fundamentals trend. This is definitely a minority trend in the teaching of the basic course. The particular approach to the course at Kansas State University is even more unique in that the "mass lecture-recitation, communication fundamentals" approach evidently is not used at any other institution.

IV. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

There are a number of general observations which relate to the study as a whole: 1. Obvious weaknesses to which this study was subject included (1) data error, i.e., the possibility that the respondents did not understand the questions they answered or, for whatever reason, did not supply accurate information in the questionnaire survey or personal interview; and (2) treatment error, i.e., the possibility that inaccuracies were introduced by the person tabulating, examining and presenting the data.

2. The basic speech course at Kansas State University reflects the administration's decisions and also the philosophy of the individual responsible for the basic speech course. This also appears to be true about the basic course at other schools across the nation.

3. The basic course has not changed except when someone new was made responsible for the course, and then the course changed in structure and emphasized in ways which reflected the philosophy of the individual. Since the course is a basic course in speech a number of fundamentals and procedures appear to have remained the same over the years.

4. The most popular trend in the basic speech course across the nation was and still is the public speaking, skills approach. The course at Kansas State University followed this trend from 1920 until 1959, but since then the course represents a minority trend.

5. The structure that has been adopted here at Kansas State University is not new, since other schools have used the mass lecture-recitation format, nor is the emphasis new because other schools are using the communication fundamentals emphasis. However, the combination of the mass lecture-recitation structure and the communication emphasis appears to represent a unique approach to the basic course. This reflects, again, the many individualistic approaches by which the basic speech course is taught across the nation.

Kansas State University
Department of Speech
June 1, 1965

Dear

This questionnaire is being sent to you in hope that you will be able to take a little time to answer some questions about your teaching at Kansas State University (Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science). Through my research I have found that while on the Speech Department faculty you taught the Basic Speech Course, which has been called Extempore I, Public Speaking I, Oral English, and Oral Communications at various times.

For my Master's thesis I would like to study both the continuity and the change in the purpose and content of the basic speech course at Kansas State. To do this I need the help of you and other former Kansas State University faculty members. The project you will be aiding is concerned with developing a complete picture of the history of the Basic Course. It is not my concern to judge the instructors, but to try to determine the change, if any, that has occurred in the course over the years. Your assistance through answering the questions or contributing other information will be warmly received. It would be very helpful to me if you would complete and return the questionnaire by June 30.

Sincerely,

Vince Di Salvo
Graduate Student

VD:mk

Please mail to:

Speech Department
Eisenhower Hall
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

A STUDY OF THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

1. Which of the following descriptions most accurately describes the basic speech course (Extempore I, Public Speaking I, Oral English I or Oral Communication I) while you were teaching it? (check one)

- _____ a. Survey course in Speech
- _____ b. Specialized performance course (concentration on one aspect of speech)
- _____ c. Service course adapted to individual needs and abilities of students enrolled.
- _____ d. Other (please describe)

2. a. Was/were a textbooks(s) or a syllabus used in the basic course?

b. If you can remember, indicate the author and/or title.

- c. In computing grades what percentage of the grade was based on; speech performance, on tests, over the text and lectures and class participation?

	<u>a) Speech Performance</u>	<u>b) Tests</u>	<u>c) Written Assignments</u>	<u>both b & c</u>
75% or more	_____	_____	_____	_____
50% to 75%	_____	_____	_____	_____
About 50%	_____	_____	_____	_____
25% to 50%	_____	_____	_____	_____
Less than 25%	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. To the best of your memory what were the basic goals, aims or objectives of the basic speech course when you were teaching it? (Use the other side if needed)

-2-

4. How much of the time in the classroom was spent on theory and in practice?

	<u>Theory</u>	<u>Practice</u>
75% or more	_____	_____
50% to 75%	_____	_____
about 50%	_____	_____
25% to 50%	_____	_____
less than 25%	_____	_____

5. a. Did you set up any criteria or restrictions for acceptability in selecting topics?

b. Please describe the procedure used in selecting speaking topics.

6. a. What was/were the basic type(s) of speech(es) (to entertain, to persuade, to inspire, to actuate, to inform) given in class?

b. What form of presentation (extemporaneous, memorized, script, impromptu) was emphasized and why? (use the other side if needed)

-3-

7. To the best of your memory indicate the relative importance of the following fundamentals commonly covered in a basic speech course. (Please evaluate each one.)

	<u>Heavily Emphasized</u>	<u>Generally Emphasized</u>	<u>Just Covered</u>	<u>Gen. Not covered</u>	<u>Intentionally not covered</u>	<u>Don't Remember</u>
a. Physical presentation (gestures)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Supporting material	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Oral presentation (diction)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Research & Preparation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Outline Form	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Organization	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Gaining Self Confidence	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Audience Orientation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. To the best of your memory how did you handle the job of criticizing the speeches? (Did you do it, a designated group, an individual or the class through oral or written critiques). (Use the other side if needed)
9. To the best of your memory did you have the students analyze and write critiques of speeches, either published speeches, speeches by guests on the campus or student speeches in class? If yes, please describe. (Use other side if needed)

Any additional information, memories, or names that would aid me in developing a more complete overview of the basic speech course would be appreciated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Hurst R., (Allegheny College, Pa.) "A New First Course in Speech and English," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 24, 1, 1938, p. 70-77.
- Bagwell, Paul D., (Michigan State Col.) "A Composite Course in Writing and Speaking," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 31, 1, 1945, p. 79-87.
- Baker, Virgil L., (Univ. of Arkansas) "More on the Yeager-Brigance Controversy," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 17, 2, 1931, p. 264-67.
- Barnes Harry G., (Univ. of Iowa) "Basic Concepts of Speech Education," Speech Teacher, Vol. 1, 1, 1952, p. 14-19.
- Barnes, Harry G., "Teaching the Fundamentals of Speech at the College Level," Speech Teacher, Vol. 3, 4, 1954, p. 239-251.
- Bassett, Lee Emerson, (Leland Stanford Jr. Univ.) "The Place of Declamation in the College Curriculum," The Public Speaking Review, Vol. 1, 8, 1912, p. 238-41.
- Brown, Frank E. "Extempore Speaking at Drake University," The Public Speaking Review, Vol. 1, 2, 1911, p. 87-88.
- Bryngelson, Bryng, (Univ. of Minn.) "Speech Hygiene," Quart. Journ. Sp. Vol. 22, 4, 1936, p. 611-614.
- Committee on Speech Education in Teacher and Normal Colleges, "Speech Education in Teacher-Training Institutions," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 15, 1, p. 42-61, 1931.
- Committee on Teacher Education, "Speech in Teacher Education," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 32, 1, 1946, p. 80-102.
- Coulton, Thomas E. (Brooklyn Col.) "Recent Trends in College Speech Curricula," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 22, 4, 1937, p. 603-613.
- Crocker, Lionel, (Denison Univ.) "Rhetoric in the Beginning Course," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 29, 3, 1943, p. 314-17.
- Crocker, Lionel, (Univ. of Mich.) "A Plan for a Course in Extemporaneous Speaking," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 11, 1, 1925, p. 48-53.
- Crowell, Laura, (Univ. of Washington) "The Process-Inquiry Speech," Speech Teacher, Vol. 1, 3, 1952, p. 167-73.
- DeBoer, John J., (Roosevelt Col.) "English in A 'Communication' Program," Quart. Journ. Sp., Vol. 31, 3, 1945, p. 291-295.
- Duffey, William Richard, (Univ. of Texas) "The Foundation Course in Public Speaking," Quart. Journal of Publ. Speaking, Vol. 3, 2, 1917, p. 163-171.

- Flemming, Edwin G., (Univ. of Wis.) "An Elementary College Course in Speaking," Quart. Journ. of Sp. Ed. 7:3, 1921, p. 189-212.
- Forncrook, Elva M., (Smith College), "A Fundamental Course in Speech Training," Quart. Journ. of Sp. Ed. 4:3, 1918, p. 271-289.
- Fritz, Charles A., (Washington Sq. College) "Speech Courses in the Teacher's College," Quart. Journ. Sp., 14:1, 1928, p. 82-86.
- Fulton, Robert Irving (Ohio Wesleyan) "College Courses in Public Speaking," The Public Speaking Review, 3:7, 1914, p. 205-9.
- Getchell, Charles M., "Building the Fundamentals Course," Southern Speech Journ. 8:3, 1948, p. 109-14.
- Greaves, Halbert S., (U. of Utah) "Credo for Mid-Century, Toward a College Course in Fundamentals of Speech," Quart. Journ. Sp. 36:2, 1950, p. 184-88.
- Hargis, Donald, E., "The First Course in Speech," Speech Teacher, 5:1, 1956, p. 26-33.
- Hargis, Donald E., "Group Discussion and the Beginning Course," Western Speech, 7:1, 1948, p. 13-24.
- Harris, Albert Mason, (Vanderbilt Univ.), "Fostering Oral English," Quart. Journ. of Sp. Ed., 11:2, 1925, p. 124-130.
- Harris, A. M., "Declamation in the College Curriculum," The Public Speaking Review, 1:5, 1912, p. 133-35.
- Hayworth, Donald, (Univ. of Akron), "The Organization of a Department of Speech," Quart. Journ. of Speech, 19:2, 1933, p. 356-363.
- Hicks, Philip M. (Swarthmore College) "Method in Teaching of Declamation," The Public Speaking Review, 3:7, 1914, p. 210-211.
- Hollister, Richard D., (Ann Harbor, Michigan) "Effective Declamation," The Public Speaking Review, 3:3, 1913, p. 15-20.
- Hollister, R. D.T., (Univ. of Mich.) "The Beginning Course in Oratory," The Quart. Journ. of Pub. Sp., 3:2, 1917, p. 172-173.
- Hollister, Richard D. T., "The Beginning Course in Oratory at the University of Michigan," Quart. Journ. of Pub. Sp. 3:3, 1917, p. 172-3.
- Hollister, R. D. T., "The Aims of a Beginning Course," Quart. Journ. of Sp. Ed., 6:3, 1920, p. 17-21.
- Houghton, Harry Garfield, (Univ. os Wis.) "A Beginning Course in Public Speaking for Colleges and Universities," Quart. Journ. of Sp. Ed., 4:2, 1918, p. 150-159.
- Hunt, Everett Lee, (Huron College) "Academic Public Speaking," Quart. Journ. of Pub. Sp., 3:1, 1917, p. 27-36.

- Kay, Wilbur Jones, (Washington and Jefferson College) "Course I in Public Speaking at Washington and Jefferson College," Quart. Journ. of Pub. Speak., 3:3, 1917, p. 242-48.
- Ketcham, V. A., (Ohio State) "Public Speaking Courses in State Universities," Quart. Journ. of Pub. Sp., 3:3, p. 286-289, or Educational Review, Feb., 1917, p. 151-160.
- Knower, Franklin H., "Communication--A Step Forward?" Quart. Journ. Sp., 31:4, 1945, p. 490-492.
- Lembke, Russell, W. (Washington State Normal) "The Fundamentals of Speech Course in the Teacher Training School," Quart. Journ. Sp., 24:1, 1938, p. 66-69.
- McCrery, Lester Lyle, "The Status of Speech Education in America's Science and Engineering Colleges," Speech Teacher, 2:3, 1953, p. 181-190.
- Mills, Glen E., (Northwestern Univ.) "Speech in a Communication Course," Quart. Journ. Sp., 33:1, 1947, p. 40-45.
- Morse, Wayne L., (Univ. of Minn.) "The Mental-Hygiene Approach in a Beginning Speech Course," Quart. Journ. Sp., 14:4, 1928, p. 543-554.
- Murray, Elwood, (Univ. of Denver) "Speech in the Total School Curriculum" So. Sp. Journ., 17:4, 1952, p. 234-240.
- Newcomb, Charles M., (Ohio Wesleyan Univ.) "The Standardization of First Year Courses," Quart. Journ. Sp., 6:2, 1920, p. 43-50.
- Norvelle, Lee R., (Indiana Univ.) "A Consideration of Individual Differences in Class Room Instruction in Beginning Courses," Quart. Journ. Sp., 8:2, 1922, p. 53-60.
- Norvelle, Lee, "Fundamental Objectives of a Teacher of Speech in 1935," Quart. Journ. Sp., 21:1, 1935, p. 73-81.
- O'Neill, J. M. (Univ. of Wis.) "Aims and Standards in Speech Education," Quart. Journ. of Sp. Education, 4:4, 1918, p. 346-65.
- O'Neill, J. M. (Univ. of Dartmouth) "Department of English and Public Speaking," The Public Speaking Review, 2:7, 1913, p. 321-338.
- Paul, Wilson B. and Frederick Sorensen and Elwood Murray, (Univ. of Denver) "A Functional Core for the Basic Communication Course," Quart. Journ. Sp., 32:2, 1964, 232-244.
- Robinson, Frederick B., "Oral English as a College Requirement," Public Speaking Review I, 1911, p. 2-7.
- Robinson, Frederick, (College of the City of N. Y.) "The Place of Speech Training in General Education," The Public Speaking Review, 3:2, 1913, p. 42-49

- Rosenberg, Janeete Stout, (Troy St. Teachers) "A Basic Course in Communication Skills," So. Sp. Journ., 20:4, 1955, p. 345-52.
- Ryan, J. F., "Recent Tendencies in the Teaching of Public Speaking in Colleges," English Journ. 8, p. 90
- Ryan, J. P., (Grinnell) The Department of Speech At Grinnell, The Quart. Journ. of Pub. Sp. 3:3, 1917, p. 203-209.
- Shurter, Edwin Dubois, (Univ. of Texas) "Oral English in the Schools," The Pub. Speaking Review, 2:5, 1912, p. 148-54.
- Smith, Bromley, (Bucknell Univ.) "Public Speaking in New England Colleges," The Quart. Journ. of Pub. Sp., 3:1, 1917, p. 57-68.
- Smith, Elmer W., "Oral English as a College Entrance Requirement," Public Speaking Review, Vol. I. No. 2, 1911, p. 78-84.
- Stebbins, Marian L., "The Fundamental Course in Speech for Institutions of Collegiate Rank," Quart. Journ. Sp., 18:3, 1932, p. 285-88.
- Tilroe, H. M., (Syracuse Univ.) "The Place of Declamation in the College Curriculum," The Pub. Sp. Rev., 1:5, 1912, p. 136-137.
- Trueblood, Thomas C., (Univ. of Mich.) "A Chapter on the Organization of College Courses in Public Speaking," Quart. Journ. Sp., 7:1, 1926, p. 1-11.
- Whan, F. L., (Municipal Univ. of Wichita) "A Survey of Enrollment in Courses in Public (Extemporaneous) Speaking in American Colleges and Universities," Quart. Journ. Sp., 25:4, 1939, p. 553-560.
- White, Eugene E., "Assembly Line Techniques: Teaching the Large Class in Speech Fundamentals," Speech Teacher, 2:4, 1953, p. 247-256.
- Winans, James A. (Dartmouth Col.) "The Sense of Communication," So. Sp. Journ., 9:1, 1943, p. 3-11.
- Winans, J. A. (Dartmouth Col.) "Is Public Speaking Out?" Quart. Journ. Sp. 17:2, 1931, p. 163-77.
- Winans, J. A., "Department of Declamation," The Pub. Sp. Rev., 1:2, 1911, p. 98-102.
- Winans, James A., "Public Speaking I at Cornell University," Quart. Journ. of Pub. Sp., 3:2, 1917, p. 153-162.
- Winter, Irvah, Lester, (Harvard) "The Teacher of Public Speaking," The Pub. Sp. Rev., 4:1, 1914, p. 21-28.

AN HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE
AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

by

VINCENT S. DI SALVO

B.S., WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY, RIVER FALLS

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1966

ABSTRACT

AN HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE BASIC SPEECH
COURSE AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

by Vincent S. Di Salvo

The purposes of this study were to present an historical overview of the basic speech course at Kansas State University, describe the basic course through instructor evaluations of the course, and compare the course with the development of basic speech courses at other institutions across the country.

In developing the historical overview of the basic course, the majority of data came from the annual Kansas State University catalogues and from personal interviews with those faculty who had been responsible for the basic course at various times. The annual catalogues covered the history of the school and were investigated for the following information: departmental philosophy, course description and academic credits. The interviews were used to collect information that might not be learned from the questionnaire responses.

A questionnaire was developed to survey instructors who had taught the basic speech course while at Kansas State University. The questionnaire was mailed to fifty-three instructors who taught the course between 1915 and 1964, and forty-one were returned with usable information. The information from the questionnaires was tabulated, analyzed and summarized by the researcher, but no statistical analyses were made.

Comparison of the Kansas State University basic speech course with basic speech courses across the nation was achieved through an extensive review of the literature dealing with the basic course. After reviewing over two

hundred articles pertaining to the basic speech course, the most relevant and descriptive articles were analyzed and reported in the study.

The results of the study revealed the following: (1) the basic speech course at Kansas State University had remained essentially the same in structure and emphasis for over forty years (1915-1956), i.e., it had a public speaking emphasis and more time was spent on practice than on theory. (2) While the course began a slow transition in 1956, it was not until 1964 that the structure and emphasis of the basic course changed significantly to a fundamentals of communication emphasis that spends equal time on practice and theory. (3) The communication fundamentals taught, the manner of speaking, and the type of speeches given have remained generally the same across the years. (4) Basic speech courses across the nation have developed a variety of approaches, due in part to the uniqueness of the local situations and the perceived needs of the students being served. These courses reflect four general trends: the elocution-delivery emphasis, the public speaking approach, mental-hygiene and communication skills. (5) The most common approach in the basic courses across the nation has been the public speaking, skills approach, and it has remained essentially the same since the beginning of the twentieth century. (6) From 1915 to 1960 the basic speech course at Kansas State University was similar to the approach that was most common across the nation. After the adoption of the mass lecture and multi-recitation sections structure in 1964, the course reflects a unique approach to teaching communication fundamentals.